

# Indigenous Voice Community Consultation

## Consultation session details

**Turrbal, Jagera and Yugara country,**

**Brisbane, 9 March 2021, 6.00pm, Session 1**

**Number of participants: 9**

## Key points raised

*Please note, this is a summary of the discussion and the views and opinions expressed by participants in consultations sessions. It is not intended to be an exhaustive summary of all points raised, but draws out the key points.*

The session was attended by 9 participants and Jamie Lowe gave an Acknowledgement of Country. Key issues discussed are summarised below.

Participants made overarching comments about the Indigenous Voice concept:

- Participants agreed there needs to be accountability and transparency in the way Australian Parliament and governments respond to the work of the Indigenous Voice.
- Participants agreed the Indigenous Voice needs to be empowered by being built from the ground up and based on relationships at the grassroots level.
- Participants acknowledged this consultation process had brought people with diverse opinions together, and generally agreed further discussions were needed in communities on the overarching Indigenous Voice design.

Participants commented on the Local and Regional Voices design:

- Some participants commented that it would be very difficult to work out the coverage of Local and Regional Voices in Queensland, given it is very different from other states, having Aboriginal Shire Councils, Local Government Areas, and areas with native title claims throughout.
- This diversity of governance and management throughout Queensland would mean individual Local and Regional Voices would cover large geographic expanses and huge diversities of interests.
- Participants strongly agreed there needs to be more Local and Regional Voices in Queensland to enable them to be effective in properly representing their diverse communities and groups.

There was consideration of some design elements of the National Voice:

- One participant expressed strong opposition to the proposed Core Model 2 (direct election), as he saw it as an easily corruptible model. The participant considered that if Core Model 2 were used as the selection process for the National Voice, it would need very strong governance and accountability arrangements around it to reduce the chances for corruption.
- There was also a concern that Core Model 2 would not be helpful in ensuring a diversity of members on the National Voice.
- Participants generally agreed members should be selected on a merit basis through Local and Regional Voices, and regardless of their gender.



- Participants agreed it is important to have linkages between the National Voice and Local and Regional Voices so as to enable grassroots views to be brought to national issues.
- There was strong agreement that two (2) members on the National Voice for Queensland would be insufficient to properly represent the diversity of views across the state. Participants generally agreed jurisdictions (including but not limited to) Queensland with large numbers of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people particularly in the many diverse remote and regional locations, need to be treated differently to jurisdictions with smaller or less diverse Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations.
- In relation to the National Voice’s advisory function, one participant commented there needs to be an arrangement in place to ensure the advice given is actually properly responded to and/or used by the Australian Parliament and Australian Government.
- Another participant expressed concern that consultation timeframes are often not sufficient enough to enable genuine consultation with people on the ground, and the timeframes for the National Voice would need to give adequate time to facilitate the genuine consultation down to communities.

Participants explored the concept of constitutional enshrinement:

- It was acknowledged that there are varying opinions among people about whether or not, and/or how constitutional enshrinement of a Voice, and/or constitutional recognition, could be achieved, and what it could actually achieve on a more practical level in relation to social policy.