What's New - August 2011

1. WIN A FREE REGISTRATION TO THE 2012 NATIVE TITLE CONFERENCE!

Just take 5 minutes to complete our publications survey and you will be in the draw to win a free registration to the 2012 Native Title Conference. Those who have already completed the survey will be automatically included. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Matthew O'Rourke, Research Assistant at the Native Title Research Unit on (02) 6246 1158 or morourke@aiatsis.gov.au

CLICK HERE TO COMPLETE SURVEY

2. Cases

***Lovett on behalf of the Gunditjmara People v State of Victoria (No 4)* [2011] FCA 931**
19 July 2011
Federal Court of Australia, Melbourne VIC
North J
These orders amend the Gunditjmara People's Part A determination of 30 March 2007. The native title holders and the State consented to the amendment of the schedules of the determination which detail the parcels of land affected by the determination. The Court elected to make the variations under O 35 r 7 of the Federal Court Rules, based on mistake and by consent, rather than relying on s. 13(1)(B) of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) (NTA), which would have required full notification to respondents.

***Lovett on behalf of the Gunditjmara People v State of Victoria (No 3)* [2011] FCA 867**
19 July 2011
Federal Court of Australia, Melbourne VIC
North J
North J made orders allowing the Gunditjmara people to file an Amended Application for Determination of Native Title to amend the description of the claim group, to include the Eastern Maar people. The Amended Application is included in this decision included in this reported decision.

***Lovett on behalf of the Gunditjmara People v State of Victoria (No 5)* [2011] FCA 932**
27 July 2011
Federal Court of Australia, Eumeralla (Yambuk) Coastal Reserve VIC
North J
This is the consent determination of Part B of the Gunditjmara people's claim, which was amended to include the Eastern Maar people as applicants. The determination area in South Western Victoria is approximately 4000 hectares, all Crown land, in 172 parcels. By consent, the Court determined that native title exists on approximately 3000ha, and does not exist on the remaining 1000ha. The main issues were, first, that some of the Part B area required further anthropological assessment, and second, there was a dispute between the Gunditjmara people and the Framlingham Trust, which had cultural heritage responsibilities under the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Protection Act 1984* (Cth).

North J dealt with the requirements of a consent determination, including that it is appropriate according to s.87(1A)(a) of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth)(NTA). His Honour described the process of mediation by two Federal Court Registrars, which included a conference of the anthropological experts, and was supported by the detailed evidence of the earlier consent determination in *Gunditjmara Part A*. North J decided that 'the process by which agreement was reached was thorough. It was focused on the legal requirements necessary to establish native title, but at the level of an arguable case. This is an appropriate approach to agreement making'. No ILUA was made with this consent determination for factors including the change of State government and the fact that a broader ILUA was made with the Gunditjmara Part A determination.

Two PBCs
North J noted that nomination of two PBCs for one determination area had not occurred in Victoria before, but that it was convenient in this case to allow the Gunditj Mirring Traditional Owners Aboriginal Corporation and the Eastern Maar Aboriginal Corporation both to become the PBCs for their respective members in this determination area. This is permitted by ss. 56(2)(a) and 57(2)(a) of the NTA and the Court followed *Moses v State of Western Australia* [2007] FCAFC 78; (2007) 160 FCR 148 [376]-[386] in applying this provision. The two corporations have entered an agreement to manage heritage effectively. His Honour concluded that 'the fact that these neighbours have been able to cooperate in the resolution of the shared rights and interests in the boundary area is testimony to the capacity of strong dynamic Indigenous peoples to administer their affairs efficiently, competently, and in a spirit of harmony which is an example to all Australians'.

***Edwards v Santos Limited (No 3)* [2011] FCA 886**
5 August 2011
Federal Court of Australia, Brisbane QLD (via videolink to Sydney NSW)
Logan J
This is a decision of the Federal Court in a matter remitted to it by the High Court in a decision of 30 March 2011, which was summarised on page 8 of NTRU Newsletter March/April 2011 at http://www.aiatsis.gov.au/ntru/docs/newsletter/MarApr11.pdf. That High Court decision had set aside Logan J's original judgment, as well as the judgment of the Full Federal Court which had affirmed Logan J's original judgment. The original judgment had dismissed an application by the native title applicants (Wongkumara) seeking declarations relating to the legal status within the Native Title Act future acts regime of prospective petroleum leases to be issued to Santos Ltd or Delhi Petroleum Pty Ltd, and seeking to restrain the Queensland government from granting such petroleum leases. Because the original judgment had been set aside by the High Court, Logan J now had to reconsider the application by the Wongkumara applicants. Before the substantive hearing of the application, however, the Wongkumara applicants sought orders from Logan J disqualifying himself from hearing the application. They argued that Logan J should disqualify himself because there was a reasonable basis for believing that his Honour might not bring an impartial mind to resolving the question before him, in light of rulings he had previously made about the merits of their case. Logan J dismissed this argument on two bases. Firstly, his Honour found the applicants had waived any right to argue the bias point, because they had applied to the High Court to have the matter remitted to Logan J – if they had considered that his Honour should not hear the case, they ought to have raised that in the High Court. Secondly, Logan J ruled that there could be no reasonable apprehension of bias on his part, because he had not made findings of fact at first instance but rather had only ruled on the law, which had now been overturned by the High Court. Logan J will preside over the rehearing of the substantive application.

***Barnes v Northern Territory of Australia* [2011] FCA 879**
5 August 2011
Federal Court of Australia, Adelaide SA (via video link with Darwin NT)
Mansfield J
This is the combined hearing of two matters. One was brought by Rodney Barnes (Gudulla) as the applicant for a native title claim group called the Janba Gurdalanji, and is referred to by the Court as the Barnes application. It comprises a small area entirely within the other – referred to as the Rockhampton/Brunette Downs application after the pastoral stations concerned. Mansfield J described the dispute at [54]: 'The dispute is largely a factual one, albeit a complex factual one. It is whether the relationship of the Barnes claim group to the Nanara/Darima area [a particular part of the overlap area] is of the character referred to in the [legal requirements], so that they hold native title rights over that area in their capacity as members of the Barnes claim group or whether they do so in the wider capacity as members of the Rockhampton/Brunette Downs claim group'.

His Honour described the evidence, which was the evidence of Mr Barnes on one side, and of a number of claimants and an anthropologist on the other. He determined that the Barnes claimants are part of a wider group that may hold native title in the overlap area as claimed in the Rockhampton/Brunette Downs application and dismissed the Barnes application. The Rockhampton/ Brunette Downs application, on behalf of the Kutinja, the Kunapa and Mangirriji, and the Kunakiji and Lukkurnu Groups of the Warrumungu, the Kujuluwa, the Marrarrabana and the Garrgarrguwarja Groups of the Wampaya, the Purrukwara Group of the Wayaka, and the Ngapa Group of the Warlmanpa, is still being negotiated.

***Cheedy on behalf of the Yindjibarndi People v State of Western Australia* [2011] FCAFC 100**
12 August 2011
Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia, Perth WA
North, Mansfield and Gilmour JJ
Background
The Yindjibarndi people had been in negotiations with FMG Pilbara Pty Ltd over applications for mining leases, which led to the publicised breakdown of negotiations and the split within the Yindjibarndi community. Before the Tribunal, the Yindjibarndi people argued that the mining lease would damage ceremonial sites, and that the interference with their religion was barred by s. 116 of the Constitution, which prohibits laws for restricting freedom of religion. The Tribunal determined that the future acts – the grant of those mining leases – could be done.

The Yindjibarndi people appealed that determination to the Federal Court, which upheld the Tribunal's determination. The Yindjibarndi people appealed McKarracher J's decision to the Full Federal Court on administrative law grounds.

This appeal
The Full Court considered the Yindjibarndi people's first ground of appeal that 'the Tribunal erred by determining that s.38 and s.39 of the Act did not have the intention, design, purpose or effect of prohibiting or seeking to prohibit the free exercise of the applicants' religion, contrary to s.116 of The Constitution' at [59]. The Full Court rejected this ground and agreed with McKarracher J, who had followed the rule from *Kruger v Commonwealth of Australia* [1997] HCA 27; (1996) 190 CLR 1. This rule is that a law can only be invalid for inconsistency with s.116 if its purpose – not its effect – is to prohibit the free exercise of religion. [89]

The Full Court stated the appellants' argument on international obligations at [62]: 'that the Tribunal erred in law in determining that international instruments [the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)] were irrelevant to its inquiry because there is no relevant ambiguity in s.39 of the Act'. This ground too was wholly rejected by the Full Court, which agreed with the lower Court that legislation is not to be interpreted by reference to international instruments when there is no ambiguity in the meaning of the statute. At [105] the Full Court said: 'The language of these two sections leaves no room for the contention that the Tribunal is bound to come to a particular decision favouring the freedom to enjoy culture or practise religion…. the international obligations can provide no assistance to the construction of provisions which govern the scope of the Tribunal's jurisdiction'. The Court said further that even if these sections were interpreted in line with the ICCPR, this would not have prevented the Tribunal's finding of fact that the future act determinations, subject to certain conditions, would not result in preventing the appellants from exercising their religion [105].

Other matters
Counsel for the appellants also argued orally that McKarracher J had erred in finding that FMG had complied with the heritage protection legislation, because it had previously apologised to the Yindjibarndi people for bulldozing a significant site. The Full Court noted that the argument was not pleaded in this appeal, and affirmed the finding below that this is a matter of fact and not law.

The Court qualified the Tribunal's endorsement of a passage from *Waljen* (*Western Australia v Thomas (1996)* 133 FLR 124) at 215 and 216, which heard detailed economic evidence and stated that there is public interest in mining. The Full Court commented at [138] that 'whilst it may be accepted that mining developments generally are in the public interest, it may be necessary in other circumstances for the Tribunal to consider the public interest in the particular project rather than by reference to the mining industry in general'.

***Isaacs on behalf of the Turrbal People v State of Queensland (No 2)* [2011] FCA 942**
19 August 2011
Federal Court of Australia, Sydney NSW (via videolink to Brisbane QLD)
Reeves J
This judgment dismissed an application by Ruth James, Pearl Sandy and Desmond Sandy (the Yugarapul individuals) to be joined as respondents to the Turrbal claim. Section 84(5) of the *Native Title Act* 1993 (Cth) gives the Court the discretion to join a person as a party 'if the Court is satisfied that the person's interests may be affected by a determination in the proceedings and it is in the interests of justice to do so'. It was not in dispute that a person claiming to have native title rights and interests in the claim area has a sufficient interest to be joined as a party. What was in dispute was (i) whether there was in fact any overlap between the Turrbal claim area and the area claimed as Yugarapul lands; (ii) whether the Yugarapul individuals were seeking to be joined in a personal or a representative capacity; and (iii) whether the Court's discretion should be exercised to join them as respondents.

As to the question of overlap, Reeves J stated that the relevant question was whether, on a *prima facie* basis, the interests claimed by the Yugarapul individuals could be affected by the Turrbal claim. Such a question does not involve entering into factual disputes about the correctness of the Yugarapul individuals' claims – otherwise, the judge 'would be placed in the paradoxical position of having to determine one of the factual issues in dispute in the substantive proceedings for the purposes of determining whether or not the applicants should be joined as respondents to contest that very factual issue'. On the basis of affidavits attesting to the boundaries of the Yugarapul people's lands, Reeves J found that there was a *prima facie* case for an overlap between the areas claimed, and therefore the native title rights and interests claimed by the Yugarapul individuals could be affected by the determination of the Turrbal application.

The application to be joined could not succeed, however, because the Yugarapul individuals were attempting to be joined as representatives of the Yugarapul people rather than in their personal capacities, and were doing so in order to obtain a positive determination of native title, rather than merely defensively asserting their native title rights and interests to protect them from erosion. Reeves J held that in order to be joined in that capacity, the Yugarapul individuals would have to make their own native title application under ss. 13 and 61 of the Act, with evidence that they had been duly authorised by the Yugarapul claim group. In any case, Reeves J indicated that, even if the application to be joined was made merely in a personal and defensive capacity, he would nevertheless have declined to exercise his discretion to join the Yugarapul individuals as respondents. This was because of the fact that the Turrbal claim was already set down for trial, and had been on foot for thirteen years, such that the introduction of new parties at this late stage would disrupt the progress of the matter toward resolution. Importantly, members of the Yugarapul people had known of the Turrbal application as far back as 1998, and the Yugarapul individuals offered no explanation for their lateness in applying to become respondents.

***Dunghutti Elders Council (Aboriginal Corporation) RNTBC v Registrar of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporations (No 2)* [2011] FCAFC 110**
25 August 2011
Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia, Sydney NSW
Keane CJ, Lander and Foster JJ
The Dunghutti Elders Council (Aboriginal Corporation) RNTBC had challenged the validity of a notice issued by the Registrar of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporations requiring the Council to show why it should not be put under special administration. Flick J in the Federal Court dismissed that challenge (*Dunghutti Elders Council (Aboriginal Corporation) RNTBC v Registrar of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporations* [2011] FCA 370), and the Full Court of the Federal Court dismissed an appeal against Flick J's decision. The present judgment dealt with an application by the Council to re-open the Full Court's decision. The Council argued that the Full Court had failed to deal in its judgment with one of the arguments raised in the notice of appeal. The Court dismissed the application to re-open the judgment, on the grounds that the relevant argument had not been raised before Flick J, had not been advanced at the hearing of the appeal, and in any case was without merit. The outcome is that the Council's challenge to the validity of the Registrar's notice has been unsuccessful. Accordingly, if the Council now fails to show why it should not be put under special administration, the Registrar may decide to do so.

3. Legislation & Policy

- **Native Title Respondent Funding Scheme**

  The Native Title Respondent Funding Scheme (NTRFS) provides financial assistance to native title respondents under s.213A of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) (NTA). This scheme does not provide assistance for native title claimants. Applications for assistance are assessed against the scheme's guidelines.

  Review of the NTRFS
  The existing 26 statutory and non-statutory financial assistance schemes administered by the Attorney-General's Department will be consolidated into one scheme that will cover the cost of disbursements in a wide variety of legal matters. This new scheme will commence on 1 July 2012.The NTRFS (including funding for native title officers) will be affected by these changes.

  The Attorney-General's Department will be developing a revised interest test to determinate eligibility for respondent funding in native title matters. Current funding arrangements for native title officers will also be reviewed. The Attorney-General's Department has engaged an independent consultant to conduct review of native title respondent and native title officer funding. Please see the terms of reference for the consultancy for further detail. For further information on the review, please refer to the frequently asked questions document. There is an opportunity to provide written input by email to NTRFSreview@ag.gov.au. The deadline for written submissions is 30 September 2011. For further information see the Attorney-General's Department website: http://www.ag.gov.au/www/agd/agd.nsf/Page/Legalaid_FinancialassistancebytheAttorney-Generalinnativetitlecases

- **Native Title Amendment (Reform) Bill 2011**

  On 12 May 2011 the Senate referred the Native Title Amendment (Reform) Bill 2011 for inquiry and report. Submissions closed on 29 July 2011. Twenty-seven public submissions have been received by the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee. The Committee reporting date is 20 September 2011.Visit the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee website to download these submissions: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/legcon_ctte/native_title_three/submissions.htm.

- **National Climate Change Adaptation Research Plan: Indigenous Communities**

  Consultation on the draft National Climate Change Adaptation Research Plan: Indigenous Communities closed on 26 August 2011. Contact Ann Penny on (07) 5552 7548 or Indigenouscom-narp@griffith.edu.au if you require further information on any aspects of the consultation.

4. Indigenous Land Use Agreements

- In August 2011, **7** ILUAs were registered with the National Native Title Tribunal (NNTT). See table below for more details.
- The Native Title Research Unit maintains an ILUA Summary which provides hyperlinks to information on the NNTT and ATNS websites.
- For more information about ILUAs, see the NNTT Website: ILUAs
- Further information about specific ILUAs is available in the Agreements, Treaties and Negotiated Settlements (ATNS) Database.

Date	NNTT File No.	Name	Type	State/Territory	Subject Matter
01/08/2011	SI2011/001	Yankaninna/Balparana ILUA	BCA	SA	Access
04/08/2011	WI2011/001	Thalanyji and Nanutarra Station Indigenous Land Use Agreement	BCA	WA	Access

04/08/2011	WI2011/002	Thalanyji and Uaroo Station Indigenous Land Use Agreement	BCA	WA	Access
08/08/2011	QI2011/002	Dugalunji Camp ILUA	AA	QLD	Development
22/08/2011	QI2011/006	Djiru People Tenure Resolution ILUA	AA	QLD	Tenure resolution
22/08/2011	QI2011/007	Djiru People Protected Areas ILUA	AA	QLD	Government
22/08/2011	QI2011/008	Djiru People & Ergon Energy ILUA	AA	QLD	Infrastructure

5. Other Agreements

Browse LNG Precinct Agreements

The Browse LNG Precinct Agreements, between the Western Australia State Government, the Goolarabooloo Jabirr Jabirr people and Woodside Energy Ltd (Woodside), were executed at Western Australia's Parliament House on 30 June 2011. Three separate but related agreements are available for viewing at the Department for State Development website at: http://www.dsd.wa.gov.au/8416.aspx.

- Browse LNG Precinct Project Agreement
  The Browse LNG Precinct Project Agreement is the primary native title agreement. It provides all the native title consents and approvals necessary for the establishment and operation of the precinct. It also sets out the benefits to be provided to the Goolarabooloo Jabirr Jabirr by the State Government, Woodside as the foundation proponent and any additional proponent/s.

- Browse LNG Precinct Regional Benefits Agreement
  The Browse LNG Precinct Regional Benefits Agreement fulfils a State Government commitment to provide benefits to Indigenous people of the Dampier Peninsula and broader Kimberley region. Benefits arising from the establishment and operation of the precinct will be shared across the region.

- Browse (Land) Agreement
  The Browse (Land) Agreement delivers on the State Government's commitments to:
  - limit the use of the precinct to LNG processing only;
  - rehabilitate and remediate the land after the precinct is closed; and
  - return the land to Traditional Owners at the end of precinct life.

  It also establishes the Browse LNG Precinct as the one site for all LNG developments on the Kimberley coastline. This agreement will be presented for ratification by Parliament and is unique – no other agreement of its type has been entered into between the State and Indigenous people.

6. Native Title Determinations

- In August 2011, **0** native title determinations were handed down.
- The Native Title Research Unit maintains a Determinations Summary which provides hyperlinks to determination information on the Austlii, NNTT and ATNS websites.
- Also see the NNTT Website: Determinations
- The Agreements, Treaties and Negotiated Settlements (ATNS) Database provides information about native title consent determinations and some litigated determinations.

7. Registered Native Title Bodies Corporate

The Native Title Research Unit maintains a Registered Native Title Bodies Corporate Summary document which provides details about RNTBCs in each state/territory including the RNTBC name, RNTBC type (agent or trustee) and relevant native title determination information. Additional information about the RNTBC can be accessed through hyperlinks to corporation information on the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations (ORIC) website; case law on the Austlii website; and native title determination information on the NNTT and ATNS websites.

8. Public Notices

The *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) requires that native title parties and the public must be notified of:

- proposed grants of mining leases and claims;
- proposed grants of exploration tenements;
- proposed addition of excluded land in exploration permits;
- proposed grant of authority to prospect; and
- proposed mineral development licences.

The public notice must occur in both:

- a newspaper that circulates generally throughout the area to which the notification relates
- a relevant special interest publication that:
    - caters mainly or exclusively for the interests of Aboriginal peoples or Torres Strait Islanders;
    - is published at least once a month; and
    - circulates in the geographical area of the proposed activities.

To access the most recent public notices visit the NNTT website or the Koori Mail website.

9. Native Title in the News

The Native Title Research Unit publishes Native Title in the News which contains summaries of newspaper articles relevant to native title.

10. Native Title Publications and Media Releases

AIATSIS Publications:

- Williams G, 'Recognising Indigenous peoples in the Australian Constitution: What the Constitution should say and how the referendum can be won', Vol. 5, No. 1, Native Title Research Unit, AIATSIS, 2011, p. 1-16

Abstract:
The Australian Government has made a commitment to a referendum on constitutional recognition of Australia's first peoples. In a series of two papers, *Land, Rights, Laws: Issues of Native Title* will explore where native title might fit into this debate. In the first paper, senior constitutional scholar George Williams provides an overview of the challenges facing constitutional change and the options for reform, and assesses what is required to achieve change, such as bipartisanship, popular education, and popular ownership. In the paper to follow, native title specialist Sean Brennan will outline five possible areas of constitutional change and discuss their practical implications for native title.

- Bauman T & MacDonald G (Eds.), 'Unsettling anthropology: the demands of native title on worn concepts and changing lives', Native Title Research Unit, AIATSIS, 2011.

Abstract:
This collection arose from a workshop for anthropologists in July 2010, Turning the Tide: Anthropology for Native Title in South-East Australia. Held at Sydney University and co-convened by the University of Sydney and the Native Title Research Unit, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, the workshop addressed issues of native title anthropology in what is often referred to as 'settled' Australia. In these areas, native title — as a form of justice and recognition for Indigenous peoples — has proven a

particularly frustrating experience. The title of the workshop recalled the various Yorta Yorta native title decisions in Victoria, and Olney J's quoting of Justice Brennan in Mabo (No 2) (1992, at [60]): 'when the tide of history has washed away any real acknowledgement of traditional law and any real observance of traditional customs, the foundation of native title has disappeared'.

Modelling the connection of native title claimants to their land in ways that are acceptable to the adversarial native title context is a challenge for native title anthropologists. They are faced with embedded and static notions of tradition that fly in the face of at least half a century of national and international anthropological debates and theory, but which have received little attention in the native title sector. The book includes issues such as naming of groups, the significance of descent from deceased forebears, the constitution of society, ways of approaching Aboriginal land tenure, processes of group exclusion and inclusion, changing laws and customs, and the scale of native title groups

Other Publications:

- Amnesty International, 'The land holds us': Aboriginal peoples' right to traditional homelands in the Northern Territory', Amnesty International, August 2011.
- North Australian Indigenous Land & Sea Management Alliance (NAILSMA), 'Indigenous rights in water in northern Australia', NAILSMA, August 2011.
- Keon-Cohen QC, B, 'Mabo in the Courts: Islander Tradition to Native Title: a memoir', Australian Scholarly Publishing, North Melbourne, 2011.
- National Native Title Tribunal, National Report: Native Title, NNTT, August 2011.

Media Releases:
Native Title Services Victoria

- August 2011 – 2011-2014 Strategic Plan

Yamatji Marlpa Aboriginal Corporation

- 11 August 2011 – Kariyarra and Gnulli native title groups sign agreements
- 22 August 2011 – Invitation to discuss Constitutional Recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians

Northern Land Council

- 17 August 2011 – NLC and NAB working side by side on Blue Mud Bay

Queensland South Native Title Services

- August 2011 – Southeast Queensland Regional Research Project (SERRP)
- August 2011 – Message Tree – QSNTS Biannual newsletter

11. Workshops and Seminars:

'Anthropology Pure and Profane: The Politics of Applied Research in Aboriginal Australia'
Presenter: Professor David Trigger, University of Queensland
Dates: Friday, 16 September 2011: 09:30-11:00
Venue: Sir Roland Wilson Building, McCoy Circuit, Australian National University, Canberra
Abstract:
Is there a view that academic anthropology operates or belongs in a 'sacred' space that is distinguishable from applied research occupying a less pure, intellectually inferior and more morally profane domain? In David Triggers experience of some 30 plus years of work in Australian Aboriginal Studies, such a distinction has been both promoted and contested vigorously at times. He outlines his reading of the recent debate focusing particularly on writing from those concerned about the moral and political standing of applied anthropology. He also addresses the proposition that applied work is intellectually inadequate, particularly in being incapable of analysis of cultural change. Prompted by the critiques of applied anthropology, He reflects upon his own research career's blending of both academic and applied work. The paper addresses some case material enabling presentation of his perspective on the positive contribution of engagement beyond the academy in Australian Aboriginal anthropology.

To register or for more details contact Pamela McGrath at the Centre for Native Title Anthropology, ANU on (02) 6125 5859 or pam.mcgrath@anu.edu.au

Indigenous Justice Forum: Legal Pathways to Reconciliation

Indigenous leaders share their aspirations for the future of Australia's legal landscape and explore ways we can use the law to achieve Reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians.

Date: Wednesday 21 September 2011, 6.00pm - 8.30pm
Venue: The Drill Hall, ND25, Mouat Street, Fremantle
Master of Ceremonies: Clive Walley, Head of Indigenous Health Team, Notre Dame School of Medicine
Welcome to Country: Barry McGuire, Nyoongar Representative
Keynote Address: Leah Armstrong, CEO Reconciliation Australia
Panelists:

- Mick Gooda - Constitutional Reform, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner
- Dennis Eggington - Criminal Justice, CEO Aboriginal Legal Service of Western Australia
- Glen Kelly - Native Title, CEO South West Aboriginal Land and Sea Council
- Tammy Solonec - International Mechanisms, Director, National Congress of Australia's First Peoples

The lecture is free for members of the public and students or $100 for those wishing to claim CPD points. Refreshments provided. Please RSVP to courtney.ebbs@nd.edu.au or 08 9433 0720

12. Training and Professional Development Opportunities

Aurora Project
The Aurora Project provides a range of training and professional development opportunities for legal, anthropology and other research staff, field and community liaison officers, management and corporate services staff of native title representative bodies (NTRBs). Some programs may also be useful for representatives from prescribed bodies corporate (PBCs). Programs are funded by the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA). There is no cost to NTRB staff and PBC representatives to attend, although participants' organisations are responsible for funding travel, accommodation and associated expenses. See the Aurora Project: 2011 Program Calendar for further information.

University of Queensland
A new course will be offered at the University of Queensland covering theoretical areas and attend to practical skills involved in native title research. The course draws on the growing literature in this area of applied anthropology and will canvass relevant international comparative anthropological work from selected other countries.

The course will be offered in the Summer Semester of 2011/2012 (30 November 2011 – 11 February 2012). For more information including information about enrolments and aspects of the course visit the University of Queensland - School of Social Science website.

University of New South Wales
The UNSW Law School is offering an intensive course in Native Title Law, Policy and Practice in January 2012. The course will run in Sydney in the week commencing Monday 16 January 2012 on the UNSW Kensington campus. Over four days, the course examines the essential elements of native title law in Australia. It also covers the broader policy and political debates that have influenced the evolution of Australian native title law over nearly twenty years and the practical impacts of native title on the ground.

For more information about the content of the course, contact the course convenor Sean Brennan at the UNSW Law School on 02 9385 2334 or s.brennan@unsw.edu.au