

RISKY



Australia's Constitution is our most important legal document. Every word can be open to interpretation.

Enshrining the Voice in the Constitution means it's open to legal challenge and interpretation by the High Court.

Legal experts don't agree, and can't know for sure, how any High Court will interpret such a constitutional change. This opens a legal can of worms.

Labor's proposed Voice model isn't just to the parliament, but to all areas of "executive government".

This gives it basically unlimited scope – from The Reserve Bank to Centrelink¹. Or in the words of a constitutional law professor "from submarines to parking tickets"².

There is also a risk of considerable delays to government decision making.

This risks dysfunctional government.

"I would foresee a decade or more of constitutional and administrative law litigation arising out of a voice..."

Ian Callinan AC KC, Former High Court Judge¹

"I think it's fatally flawed because what it does is retain the full range of review of executive action. This means the Voice can comment on everything from submarines to parking tickets...We will have regular judicial interventions..."

Professor Greg Craven AO, constitutional law expert²

"The potential for great irremediable harm to Australian society means the voice should never be incorporated into the Australian Constitution..."

*Terence Cole AO RFD KC,
Former NSW Supreme Court Judge³*

"This Voice will not unite us, it will divide us..."

*Senator Jacinta Nampijinpa Price,
Shadow Minister for Indigenous Affairs*

"How can Australians possibly agree to something where we don't know the detail?"

Senator Kerryne Liddle, Shadow Minister for Child Protection and the Prevention of Family Violence

¹ The Australian, 17/12/2022

² Daily Mail, 23/3/2023

³ Submission to Inquiry into the Voice Referendum, 19/4/2023

¹ Professors M. Davis and G. Appleby, The Australian, 1/4/2023

² Professor G. Craven. Daily Mail, 23/3/2023

Important
information about

THE
VOICE

RISKY

UNKNOWN

PERMANENT

WHAT THIS REFERENDUM IS ABOUT

All fair-minded Australians want to help Indigenous Australians in disadvantaged communities improve their lives.

The Liberal Party supports regional voices, with powers clearly defined by parliament.

However, the Albanese Government wants to go much further – enshrining a Voice **in the Constitution**, with few limits to its scope and few details.

This is legally risky, with unknown consequences. And it will be permanent.

**DON'T KNOW?
SAY NO.**

UNKNOWN ?

Australia hasn't changed its Constitution by referendum since 1977.

It's a big decision, yet Labor refuses to reveal any details before the vote.

They're asking Australians to vote without knowing exactly how the Voice would operate.

Labor is putting the cart before the horse.

Some Voice activists say this will be a first step to reparations and other radical changes.

So, what comes next?

DIVISIVE

Enshrining in our Constitution a body for only one group of Australians, means permanently dividing Australians by race.

Many Indigenous Australians don't want this. The Constitution belongs to all Australians.

We need to bring Australians together, not divide them.

INEFFECTIVE

Having a centralised voice – rather than regional voices – risks overlooking the needs of regional and remote communities.

COSTLY \$

In 2023-24, the Government allocated \$4.3 billion for the National Indigenous Australians Agency¹, which has 1,400 staff. Their role is to advise Government on improving the lives of Indigenous Australians.

Labor's Voice would basically replicate this. It's not clear how the two would interact or overlap.

PERMANENT !

Once a Voice is in the Constitution it won't be undone.

Once a High Court makes an interpretation, parliament can't overrule it.

We'll be stuck with negative consequences.

¹ Prime Minister and Cabinet, Portfolio Budget Statements, 2023-24.