



Australians for Constitutional Monarchy

**Joint Select Committee on Constitutional
Recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait
Islander Peoples**

Friday 30th January 2015

Submission by Australians- for Constitutional Monarchy

1. Summary

This is a submission by Australians for Constitutional Monarchy to the Joint Select Committee on Constitutional Recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples. ACM proposes that the issue of the Constitutional Recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples be referred to a constitutional convention consisting principally of elected delegates, and certain ex officio and nominated delegates.

2. ACM

2.1 Australians for Constitutional Monarchy (ACM) was launched at a public meeting on 4 June 1992. The ACM Memorandum and Articles of Association (the Constitution) and Charter were signed on 18 March 1993. Two of the seven subscribers were Aboriginal Australians – former Senator Neville Bonner AO and Margaret Valadian AO CBE . Of the others, one had been a politician, the former Lord Mayor of Sydney, Doug Sutherland. He was to head the ACM NSW ticket for the Constitutional Convention. Then there was a former Chief Justice, Sir Harry Gibbs, the then President of the NSW Court of Appeal, Justice Michael Kirby, (soon to go to the High Court) an eminent QC and soon to be made a judge, Lloyd Waddy (our first National Convenor) as well as the celebrated authority on Australian literature and former ABC Chairman, Dame Leonie Kramer. Divisional Councils and branches were established across Australia and Tony Abbott became ACM's first Executive Director.

2.2 The mission of ACM is to preserve to protect and to defend our heritage: our Australian constitutional system, the role of the Australian crown in our system and our flag.

2.2 In 1996, ACM organised a march from the gates of Government House to the front of Parliament House in Sydney to protest against the New South Wales Premier Bob Carr's unpopular attempt to downgrade the Office of Governor and expel future governors from their purpose built home, Government House. With over 20,000 participating, it was among the largest peaceful non-political non-

union demonstrations the city has ever seen and by far the largest demonstration ever called in Australia by any monarchist or republican organisation.

2.3 In the 1997 election for Constitutional Convention, ACM became the second largest group after the Australian Republican Movement. ACM won 73.39% of the constitutional monarchist vote, the balance being shared by Bruce Ruxton's Safeguard The People, the Australian Monarchist League, Queenslanders for Constitutional Monarchy and the Fred Nile's Christian Democrats.

2.4 The convention met in February 1998 with 76 elected, 40 ex officio and 36 nominated delegates. Of the 36 delegates nominated by the Howard government, only 10 are constitutional monarchists.

2.5 According to an independent researcher, "By 1999 ACM, like its opposite number ARM in the case of republicans, appears to have become the spokesperson for monarchists"ⁱ. This was reflected in the appointments by the government of Yes and No case committees. These were made up of Convention delegates on the basis of votes cast in the election. The No Case consisted of 2 independent republicans and 8 monarchists, all ACM delegates to the Convention. Kerry Jones chaired the committee. ACM also played a major role in the preparation the No case for the Yes/No booklet distributed by the Australian Electoral Commission, the first draft being prepared by Professor David Flint.

2.6 After the referendum, ACM continued to argue the case for the retention of the Crown in the constitutional system. Today, ACM remains a grass roots organisation. It continues to advocate the retention of constitutional monarchy as the preferred model of governance for our Commonwealth. Its activities include disseminating information, managing a major educational project, producing educational materials, providing speakers for public forums, and organising gatherings so fellow Australians can have an opportunity to learn more about the unique system of government that has helped to safeguard our cherished democratic traditions and freedom. ACM depends on volunteers and on the generosity of its supporters. ACM financial records have always been audited, and ACM files income tax and GTS returns. All funding is from supporters and is spent carefully and effectively.

3. ACM and Recognition prior to 28 November 2015

3.1 Until 28 January 2014, ACM took no position on the proposal that the indigenous people be recognised in the Constitution, except on one aspect referred to below. This was not because of any lack of interest by members and supporters; there was a view that this was not central to the ACM mission which is to preserve, to protect and to defend our heritage: our Australian constitutional system, the role of the Australian crime in our system and our flag.

3.2 The one point on which ACM did take a position was in January 2014. The organisation disagreed completely and publicly from the strongly put view by the leader of another monarchist organisation that a referendum on the constitutional recognition of the indigenous people would be accompanied by “almost certain violence”.

3.3 On 27 January 2014, after the spraying of graffiti on Captain Cook's cottage in Melbourne, the national chairman of the Australian Monarchist League Philip Benwell warned:

“The appalling desecration of Captain Cook's cottage in Melbourne by anti-Australia Day vandals will cause many people to resile from the very thought of a referendum and the now almost certain violence that will accompany it.”ⁱⁱ

3.4 ACM immediately declared that “is in no way associated with a prediction of “almost certain violence” which would allegedly accompany the proposed aboriginal recognition referendum.”ⁱⁱⁱ The statement continued:

“This prediction was in a Media Release by Philip Benwell headlined “Aboriginal Recognition Set Back For Decades”. In this he says the Rudd and Gillard governments moved away from their commitment to hold a referendum because of vandalism and of a demonstration where Ms. Gillard had lost her shoe. (The demonstration was provoked by misinformation by a member of her staff who then resigned.)

“He predicts in the Media Release that vandalism - and this demonstration – “undoubtedly sets back the acceptance of Aboriginal recognition by decades”.

"The contents of the media release and a subsequent interview were reported nationally by Simon Cullen for the ABC on 27 January 2014, by Andrew Green in this video report as well as on ABC radio.

"ACM, as the nation's leading constitutional monarchist association, distances itself completely from these predictions.

"ACM is not a political party. Our mission is limited and we do not take a position on constitutional issues unrelated to the core of our constitutional system, which is centred on an indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under the Crown.

"That said, it is difficult to see why Australians would approach the proposed referendum in any way different from the way in which they have approached all others - thoughtfully and peacefully."

4. ACM's current position on recognition

4.1 On 28 November 2014, while he was delivering the Neville Bonner Oration at the Fifteenth Annual National Conference of ACM, the Prime Minister, Tony Abbott, called on ACM to support and not to oppose the movement for the recognition of the indigenous people in the Constitution.^{iv}

He said:

"As the constitution's fiercest defenders, our temptation is to dismiss all change as constitutional vandalism – but today I invite you to consider this change more as renewal and refurbishment; as a grace note in this most serviceable of foundation documents."

4.2 It is important to see this in the full text of the Oration, which follows:

It's an honour to give this lecture in memory of Neville Bonner, the first Aboriginal Member of the Australian Parliament, a member of the Foundation Council of Australians for Constitutional Monarchy, and a delegate to the 1998 Constitutional Convention to consider whether Australia should become a republic.

There were many fine speeches at that convention but Neville Bonner's was the one that gripped people's soul. This is what he said:

"We have come to accept your laws. We have come to accept your Constitution. We have come to accept the present system. We believed you when you said that a democracy must have checks and balances. We believed you when you said that not all positions in society should be put out for election. We believed you when you said that judges should be appointed, not elected. We believed you when you said that the Westminster system ensures that the government is accountable to the people. We believed you when you taught us that integral to the Westminster system is a head of state who is above politics. We believed you when you said that, as with the judiciary, Government House must also be a political-free zone."

This magnificent old man, went on to say:

"How dare you! You told my people that your system was best. We have come to accept that. We have come to believe that. The dispossessed, despised adapted to your system. Now you say that you were wrong and that we were wrong to believe you. Suddenly you are saying that what brought the country together, made it independent, ensured its defence, saw it through peace and war, and saw it through depression and prosperity, must all go."

It was by far the most powerful speech of that intense period in our nation's life.

As he sat down the supporters of the "No" case all rose in their seats – and the republicans remained frozen in theirs.

And then the most unlikely figure rose in his seat – it's Neville Wran, standing to honour the dignity, conviction and wisdom of a great man.

And the rest then rose as one.

It was the only standing ovation at that convention.

Despite the many indignities that might have soured his outlook, Neville Bonner had a great love for our country, its institutions and its people.

He grasped that modern Australia has an indigenous heritage, a British foundation and a multicultural character.

His final speech brings to mind another image from Old Parliament House.

On the day of its opening back in 1927 along with the Duke of York and numerous dignitaries there was just one indigenous man present.

He was not an official guest.

He had no place of honour.

Yet his presence was as much a symbol of unity as that of our future King.

Although unacknowledged, uncounted in any census and not dressed in the finery of others, Jimmy Clements – for that was his name – carried with him an Australian flag.

It was his demonstration that he loved our country as much as anyone – despite not sharing in all its benefits.

As a constitutional conservative, like Neville Bonner, my instinct is to keep the constitution; to conserve the constitution exactly as is.

“Don’t fix what isn’t broken” was the rally cry of the “No” campaign at the Constitutional Convention and at the subsequent referendum.

Like John Howard, my distinguished predecessor as leader of the Liberal Party and of the Liberal National Coalition, I don’t normally seek to change the constitution.

I don’t seek to remove the Crown.

I don’t seek to change the separation of powers.

I don’t seek to change our representative system of government.

These days, I don't even seek to change the states' constitutional role because I appreciate that we should not lightly change that which has stood the test of time.

I understand that change is often far more trouble than it is worth.

I do, however, seek constitutional recognition of Aboriginal people in a form that would complete our constitution rather than change it.

Today, I invite the friends of our constitution to suspend scepticism.

As a constitutional conservative, I would never seek change unless I was convinced that it would be change for the better.

That, after all, is what the founders of our constitution envisaged when they provided a mechanism for changing it.

Changing the constitution was meant to be hard: it requires an act of Parliament, a vote of the people and a majority of four of six states.

It is rightly much harder than changing a law but it is not meant to be impossible because our constitution's founders never imagined that the constitution should never change.

Sometimes, after all, change is necessary for survival and sometimes change is desirable for improvement.

The opening of our constitution states that the Australian people "humbly relying on the blessings of Almighty God have agreed to unite in one indissoluble federal Commonwealth under the Crown".

It is an acknowledgement of our British and our Christian heritage but it does not in any way hindered the development of a free, multicultural nation which gives people a fair go and encourages them to have a go.

It is precisely because we have done so well under the constitution we have that we should be so cautious about changing it.

Our whole history, though, is one of change for the better – change that builds on what we have rather than throw it away to start again.

The challenge is to find a way to acknowledge Aboriginal people in the Constitution without otherwise changing it.

That's the task now engaging the Government and our Parliament.

I do not underestimate its difficulty but I don't underestimate its importance either if we are to achieve all we can as a nation.

You are rightly cautious about any change to our constitution.

So was Neville Bonner.

And so is anyone who appreciates the scale of the Australian achievement over the past century.

Still, it would be an odd constitutional conservative who cherished every single clause in our constitution except the clause allowing it to be changed.

The establishment of this lecture, in his honour, was Australians for Constitutional Monarchy's tribute to Neville Bonner.

Today, I am asking you to consider a change that, if done well, I am sure he would have asked you to support.

If done well, acknowledging indigenous Australians in the constitution would strengthen our country, not weaken it.

Constitutional recognition can't substitute for real action to improve the lives of Indigenous Australians – but it can complement it.

Every day, this Government is working with Aboriginal people: to get children to school, adults to work and to make communities safe – as we should, because by far the most troubling feature of our national story is the dispossession and marginalisation of Aboriginal people.

It's not that our constitutional founders made a mistake – they simply failed to give Aboriginal people more than a passing thought.

So, in addressing this subject, our job is not to correct their work but to complete it.

Like John Howard, I have come to support the recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in the constitution because it already recognises our British heritage and, if we are to acknowledge part of our history, we should acknowledge all of it.

My hope is that any future referendum to recognise Aboriginal people will echo the successful 1967 changes, not the unsuccessful 1999 ones, which, as you will remember, were to insert a recognition preamble as well as to become a republic.

1967 was a small change to our constitution but a big change for our country.

It was Australians' first acknowledgement that Aboriginal people mattered.

It was the first sign that they should not be treated as second class citizens in their own country.

Like 1967 – but unlike 1999 – any future referendum campaign should be an act of affirmation rather than a political argument.

If there is to be a victory, it has to be one for all of us – as 1967 was.

Consideration of a proposal should be a conversation as much as a debate: careful, considered and civilised – because if it is to build national unity it can't be a 'winner takes all' contest.

Both sides of politics, and all Members of Parliament, are now working together on a good way forward and the best possible wording to be put to the Australian people.

The bipartisan committee chaired by the House of Representatives' first Indigenous MP, Ken Wyatt, will soon

make final recommendations about the precise changes that could be made.

We should be prepared to consider and refine any proposal for some time because it is so much better to get this right than to rush it.

The worst of all outcomes would be dividing our country in an effort to unite it.

A successful referendum would be another demonstration that Australia can in every way be a beacon of hope and an exemplar of unity and decency.

As the constitution's fiercest defenders, our temptation is to dismiss all change as constitutional vandalism – but today I invite you to consider this change more as renewal and refurbishment; as a grace note in this most serviceable of foundation documents.

Indigenous culture, after all, is part of our common heritage as Australians; as much as our language, our Parliament, our system of law and our Crown.

If all Australians are to walk forward together, the least we can do is acknowledge the first of us in our foundation document.

4.3 In moving the vote of thanks, ACM's National Convenor Professor David Flint proposed the people be brought into the issue from the beginning through the calling of an elected and unpaid constitutional convention. This would be to discuss and recommend referendums on this and other burning issues, but not change to a politicians' republic. The latter had been well and truly examined over a decade and overwhelmingly rejected by the people. He cited the example of the 1897-1898 federation convention.

4.4 It is highly appropriate to the process for a referendum on the recognition of the indigenous people, that convention be recalled. It is clear that without that elected constitutional convention, federation would probably never have been achieved. The previous constitutional convention held in 1891 was not elected. While it agreed to a Federal Constitution, the six state or then colonial parliaments could not be persuaded to adopt it.

4.5 After a call from the people's Corowa conference in 1893, a convention was elected and met in Adelaide in March 1897, then in Sydney in August, and finally in Melbourne in January 1898. In between the sessions there was much consultation, debate in the colonial parliaments and public discussion of the draft Constitution. This was followed by an unsuccessful referendum, the adoption by the Premiers of some amendments satisfactory to New South Wales, and a final series of successful referendums in each of the six colonies. The extraordinary fact was that in three years, without modern transport and modern communications, a constitution was approved by the Australian people, put through the Imperial Parliament and given Royal Assent by Queen Victoria on 8 July 1900.

4.6 Referring to his Neville Bonner Oration to the 15th ACM National Conference, Prime Minister Tony Abbott told supporters of RECOGNISE at their inaugural dinner on 14 December, 2014, the movement for the constitutional recognition of the indigenous people, that for a referendum to succeed there should be no opposition from any group of substance.^v

He said that he had invited his "former colleagues at Australians for Constitutional Monarchy... to suspend their scepticism."

"And I told them that it was impossible to cherish every single clause of a constitution, except the provision to change it."

"Tonight," he continued, "I say to my friends here at RECOGNISE, we have to temper our ambitions, because nothing would set back the cause of our country and the rightful place of Aboriginal people at its heart, than a referendum that failed."

Mr. Abbott had previously indicated that it was while he worked at ACM and in his discussions there with Senator Neville Bonner that he developed his strong interest in indigenous welfare and recognition.

5 The Australian Labor Party, Recognition and a constitutional convention.

5.1 In his speech to the RECOGNISE inaugural dinner on 14 December 2014, opposition leader Bill Shorten confirmed Labor's strong support for the principle of the recognition of the indigenous people in the constitution.^{vi} He said that the referendum question

must involve the complete representative and empowered participation of our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander brothers and sisters.

"And this is where the idea of a constitutional convention offers one important, constructive way to ensure that more voices are heard.

"And perhaps building upon what we've heard, I can suggest the establishment of a formal referendum council to help guide the convention's important deliberations, to make sure that the convention isn't captured by one interest or another and provide that broader community level leadership."

6. Referendum principles

6.1 Because of its particular experience and in the context of its mission, ACM has taken a particular interest in the conduct of referendums in Australia. Our concern has been that these fairly and properly represent the views of the people of Australia. This will of course apply to any referendum on the constitutional recognition of the indigenous people.

6.2 Accordingly, made a submission in October 2009 to the House of Representatives Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee Machinery of Referendums Inquiry into the *Referendum (Machinery Provisions) Act*, 1984.^{vii} this was followed by a supplemental submission.^{viii}

6.3 In summary, ACM suggested five principles which should prevail in any change of the referendum machinery provisions legislation and government practice. These should:

- Retain the democratic right of every Australian to see and read the Yes and No cases;
- Provide public funding for the Yes and No cases (at least while public funding is available for elections);
- Direct that the counting of referendum results be in accordance with clear words of and manifest intention in section 128 of the Constitution;

- Provide a framework for the calling of further constitutional conventions on questions of great moment, but not on matters already determined by the people, such as a preamble or removal of the Australian Crown);
- Provide that in seeking any vote by the electorate on the Constitution, the Commonwealth be required to proceed only in accordance with the way the Constitution provides. This is to ensure that the details of any change are known before the vote, and not after. (This would disallow the use of a plebiscite when a referendum could have been used under the Constitution.)

6.4. During the proposed local government recognition referendum, the first two of these suggested principles were abandoned. Legislation was changed so that only one copy of the Yes/No booklet would be provided to each household. Lampooned as the “garbage tin” amendment, this would mean that the booklet sent in an envelope marked to “The Householder” would be more likely to be discarded, particularly in shared accommodation. In addition, the Yes case was to be extremely generously funded, with very small funding for the No case.

7. Referendum prospects

7.1 ACM is of course no better placed than any other groups to make predictions about a referendum on constitutional recognition. There is a widespread view in the movement for the constitutional recognition of the indigenous people that it would be better not to put a referendum if it were at all likely that the referendum would be lost.

7.2 In this regard, it would be wise to understand that opposition to constitutional recognition is not necessarily racist. Indeed many would argue that such opposition will rarely be racist.

7.3 Opposition would appear to be based on one or both of two propositions. First, it is feared that a constitutional amendment will enable activist judges to give effect to the change different from that intended. Second, there is an objection that any race or group receive separate and perhaps sole recognition in the Constitution.

8. The Freeman/Leeser proposal

8.1 ACM notes the proposal by Damien Freeman and Julian Leeser that we should rethink our approach to indigenous recognition. They argue that “instead of trying to insert some modest statement in the Constitution, we should consider adopting an “Australian Declaration of Recognition”, which would contain a powerful and poetic statement of the nation that Australia has become, and our aspirations for our nation’s future.”^{ix} As we understand it, the Declaration would be submitted to the people in a plebiscite along similar lines to the requirements for a referendum.

8.2 They say that sometimes “we need to think about an old problem in a new way.” They recall that in the United States, generations of Americans have drawn inspiration from the Declaration of Independence. They say:

“So too” future generations of Australians will draw inspiration from the Australian Declaration of Recognition that we might adopt in 2017. We propose that, alongside any substantive constitutional changes, all historical and aspirational statements be embodied in an Australian Declaration of Recognition. An Australian Declaration of Recognition provides the best way to address cultural issues while avoiding legal technicalities.”

8.3 ACM believes that serious consideration should be given to this proposal either as an end in itself, or in the longer term, as a possible step towards constitutional recognition. ACM believes that the Freeman/Leeser proposal for a declaration should be one of the possible solutions to indigenous recognition which should be submitted to a constitutional convention.

9. A Constitutional Convention

9.1. As we have argued above, it is clear that without an elected constitutional convention, federation would probably never have been achieved. As a result of a call from the 1893 people's Corowa Conference, a convention was elected by the people and met in three sessions held in intervals in the period from March 1897 to January 1898. The extraordinary fact was that in a matter of three years, without modern transport and modern communications, a constitution was approved by the Australian people and put through the Imperial Parliament. After the final supporting referendum in

Western Australia, the Constitution was proclaimed by Queen Victoria to take effect from 1 January 1901.

9.2 It is important to stress this achievement. Our nation was born without war, loss of blood or violence. That great founding father, Sir John Quick, who played a crucial role in achieving federation, wrote (with lawyer Robert Garran) that:

"Never before have a group of self-governing, practically independent communities, without external pressure or foreign complications of any kind, deliberately chosen of their own free will to put aside their provincial jealousies and come together as one people, from a simple intellectual and sentimental conviction of the folly of disunion and the advantages of nationhood. The States of America, of Switzerland, of Germany, were drawn together under the shadows of war. Even the Canadian provinces were forced to unite by the neighbourhood of a great foreign power. But the Australian Commonwealth, the fifth great Federation of the world, came into voluntary being through a deep conviction of national unity. We may well be proud of the statesmen who constructed a Constitution which, whatever may be its faults and its shortcomings, has proved acceptable to a large majority of the people of five great communities scattered over a continent; and proud of a people who, without the compulsion of war or the fear of conquest, have succeeded in agreeing upon the terms of a binding and indissoluble Social Compact." ^x

9.3 ACM suggests that the only way that a referendum proposal for the constitutional recognition of indigenous people could be properly considered is by involving the people from the beginning, just as we did to federate. The alternative is for a group of experts and eminent people as well as politicians, to develop and present a proposal to the people for their decision. In this scenario the people would be consulted at the very end and not be involved from the beginning. We believe that such a change of the Constitution should be considered from the beginning by the people through a representative constitutional convention. It should be the convention which prepares the referendum.

9.4 The proposal from the 1893 Corowa conference is commonly referred to as the Corowa plan. The first part of this plan, proposed by that great Founding Father Sir John Quick, was that the convention be directly elected. The second part of the plan was that when the convention agreed on a draft constitution it should make available both for public comment and examination in each of the six Colonial parliaments. After considering that, the convention should then prepare a final version. But instead of that final version being submitted to each of the six colonial or state parliaments for adoption, it should then be submitted directly to the people in each of the six colonies.

9.5 ACM believes that both aspects of the Corowa plan should apply. That is, the convention should be elected by the people, and the final version of any proposed referendum should be submitted in that form to the people. Clearly, the Federal Parliament could not surrender its powers in this regard. This principle could only be achieved by an understanding or consensus within the Parliament. This would not be enforceable but it would have substantial moral weight.

9.6 ACM proposes that the convention consist of 152 elected delegates, together with 30 ex officio delegates and 30 nominated expert & community delegates. ACM suggests that there would be eight electorates made up of the States and mainland territories, with voters in the offshore territories being included on the Northern Territory roll. It is suggested that the election be by way of optional proportional representation. The voter would have the choice of voting above the line for a group or groups or below the line as in Senate elections.

9.7 It is suggested that the number of elected delegates from each state or territory electorate would be approximately in proportion to the total number of members of the House of Representatives and the Senate for each State or Territory. This would follow the pattern adopted for the 1998 Convention.

9.8 It is suggested that all Australian parliaments be represented by ex officio delegates including the Prime Minister, all Premiers, mainland territory chief ministers as well as corresponding opposition leaders. The 30 ex officio delegates would be made up of 8 Commonwealth delegates, 18 state and 4 mainland territory delegates.

9.8 The 30 nominated expert and community delegates would be chosen by the Prime Minister in consultation with the Federal Leader of the Opposition. They would be selected to provide appropriate expertise as well as taking into consideration any parts of the Australian community which appear to be underrepresented after the convention election. In addition, some Australians prominent in the community could be appointed by expanding the number of such delegates.

9.9 ACM suggests that voting at the convention be restricted to the elected and ex officio delegates.

9.10 Delegates would be paid minimal expenses. It is expected most of the preliminary work would be done in committees using modern means of communication with plenary sessions in Canberra.

9.11 To enable it to complete its work on indigenous recognition, the convention would be elected for a term of three years. The Convention should also consider other relevant constitutional issues, particularly issues relating to the federal division of powers and the income of the Commonwealth states and territories. The Convention should not discuss any proposal to remove the Crown as discussion of this in the Parliament, in the media, in the 1998 Constitutional Convention and by the Australian people in the Convention election and in the 1999 referendum has been extensive and support for change has fallen significantly.

9.12 Within six months of the end of its term, the Convention should be entitled to request the Governor-General to continue the Convention and to call another election, and the legislation should empower the Governor-General to grant that request.

ⁱ ." (Parliamentary Library Research Paper 25 1998-1999)
http://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/rp9899/99RP25

ⁱⁱ <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2014-01-27/monarchists-warn-of-indigenous-referendum-violence/5220624>

ⁱⁱⁱ
http://www.norepublic.com.au/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=4667&Itemid=4

iv <https://www.pm.gov.au/media/2014-11-28/neville-bonner-oration-0>

v <https://www.pm.gov.au/media/2014-12-11/address-recognise-inaugural-gala-dinner-sydney-0>

vi <http://billshorten.com.au/category/speeches>

vii

<http://www.norepublic.com.au/images/stories/ACM09ReferendumMachineryInquirySUBMISSION.pdf>

viii

<http://www.norepublic.com.au/images/stories/ACM09ConstSubmissionYESNOcase.pdf>

ix <http://damienfreeman.com/constitutional-law-and-public-policy/the-australian-declaration-of-recognition/>

x J. Quick and R. Garran, *Annotated Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth* (1901), p. 225