

About submission

Disability Services and Inclusion Bill 2023 [Provisions] and Disability Services and Inclusion (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2023

The Bill engages the following rights:

- the right to privacy and reputation - Article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
- the rights of people with disabilities - Article 5 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)
- the right to social security - Article 2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)

Hello, my name is Karletta.

I would like to make a submission to this enquiry.

Can you please request removal of all references in the entire bill to "if the secretary believes" and "on reasonable grounds".

I would like a change to "information sharing arrangements". Most of my email submission is about this. I would like to add something like "to perform their duties/ job functions".

Please strip double negatives if and where they appear.

Please add something like "Non exclusive list or these specific examples/ statements are the parameters not exclusions or - if we haven't said something here that is helpful to reduce discrimination - to perform your duties - you are possibly allowed to do it".

I want actual workable information sharing arrangements. To allow people to do their jobs. Not hinder processes in their job descriptions. To allow ease of community services delivery.

How "current information sharing arrangements" aren't working:

Like the denied requests while investigating Peter Collins/ PWC.

Like the denied requests of the Children and Young People's

Commissioner(?) investigating the final case study of the Royal Commission.

Like the denied requests I have trying to get my medical records shared between Centrelink and the NDIS and Queensland Health and the former QLD Disability Services(?) I was a client of.

Like the denied requests and exploitation and discrimination of and/or by staff of Job Network Providers when interacting with Centrelink and people in Mutual Obligations.

(Example: House of Reps Committee ID: 1730704 A submission included real-time example of a Mutual Obligations participant from Emerald who was currently in a Brisbane hospital from a heart-attack who - in a hospital - can't get his mutual obligations removed.

This abdication of information-sharing duties or co-facilitation between QLD Health and Centrelink is grotesque, in my eyes.)

To support people when interacting with government systems and government funded bodies. Between departments and government funded services (Health, Housing, Centrelink, NDIS, ATO ect.).

I please ask if this bill persists in containing "reasonable grounds" - parameters to be explained and/or shown. What is reasonable - provide examples/ parameters - like information is written in the Public Services Act or Guidelines (written or co-written by Professor Terry Carney). What is unreasonable - provide examples/ parameters.

I don't understand these references. They provide no guidance or parameters. I don't have the energy or time, but I'm sure many committees and lawyer inter-agencies can explain how "on reasonable grounds" is distinctly unhelpful and unworkable - without examples of reasonable and unreasonable.

With Information Sharing Powers - allow amendment - to perform their duties. I don't understand how "what the secretary believes" has any relevance to the file notes, person's feelings and words about or facts in time and space of actions and inactions. For example, whether age, disability, systemic, inter-departmental, employment etc discrimination happened.

If there needs to be one final arbiter "to make a final decision", please stipulate that. Who that may be. For example, the Human Rights Commission and or a State or Territory or Federal Commission for Children and Young People. If there are multiple jurisdictions and Provide examples of out of scope and in scope of the powers. For example, "has the empathy, humanity-human rights focus, foresight and systemic review abilities to understand the matter and the multiple and compounding consequences of their actions, along with the ability and powers at a systemic to front-line worker to change the ease of systems to work together to remove discrimination and barriers".

Can you please request the bill stipulates up top/ in explanatory section - non mention of (main/ intention of bill - to remove opportunities for discrimination) activities does not mean they are disallowed. It is not a valid reason or excuse for systemic neglect and discrimination in the delivery of all face-to-face interactions, all service delivery, all commercial activities etc.

For example - information disclosure: It is vital for the services to share information. It is not ok or fair to send potentially traumatised people like myself on paperwork / request to share information forms wild goose chases getting and filling out and signing then updating and repeating the process with each and every service contract.

If find this abdication of service providers to facilitate or do this information sharing process a deeply troubling and traumatic and counter-productive process. Service providers should communicate with each other. They need to. This switch from long-term funded organisational administration to personal responsibility is destructive to my mind, body and circumstances, not to mention to get any task and goal done when needed.

Case study for parameters of information sharing:

Disability Royal Commission 2023 Final Case study. QLD. Child neglect and abuses - 17 year interactions / alerts to child safety authorities.
Investigations by a Queensland Youth (ombudsman? examiner?) to do a case and systems review failed.
His inter-departmental requests were denied repeatedly, stating current Information Sharing Arrangements/ Requirements.

He has undertaken a review and written two versions of a report into the systemic happenings. His investigations were (to say the least) incomplete.

I put, please, that information sharing arrangements be allowed for undertaking service delivery, client interactions, systemic reviews in the the disclosure of protected information will not be arbitrarily disclosed and occur within the existing legislative parameters and safeguards of those above-mentioned legislation.

information to examine current and past child abuse, neglect etc case management and system failures. Currently, seen in the royal commission - final case study of the two Qld boys, the QLD inspector? examiner? was blocked from receiving files from all departments.

Unless the death was of a child, not their care-giver, as was the case. Then he could have had (coronial-enquiry-like) information requests adhered to.

the young people's client case conferences

I am shot/ exhausted. Need to stop.

Please contact me for follow up. Thank you.

Karletta.

Karletta Abianac

www.MusingsofKarlettaA.com/about