



### Public Question Time

---

#### Question from Isaac Hermann:

The 'Picturing Democracy' Exhibition text asks 'Who and What is not seen?' Does Council consider that the exclusion of minorities from this exhibition is acceptable? Did the Exhibition Commission Brief require multiculturally inclusive content? How does the exclusion of Jewish, Buddhist, Chinese, Taoist, Hare Krishna and Hindu places of worship enhance social inclusion? With significant Jewish content that is readily available from the City Collection - why does it only form 1 out of 106 images? With significant Chinese content that is readily accessible from the City Collection - why is there zero Chinese content? The Mayor and Councillors joint declaration in December 2025: 'Stand in Solidarity Against Antisemitism' notes: 'To our Jewish Community we say: 'We see you. We stand with you'. Why has this Exhibition made the Jewish Community invisible and 'unimaginable'? There looks to also be issues with Council's 'Social Cohesion, Diversity and Inclusion' Policy': How does this demographically distorted Exhibition reflect Council Policy? The Australian Human Rights Commission notes there is nothing casual about racism. Will Council consider whether there may be issues of the Racial Discrimination Act of 1975? Localities are left out – Ripponlea is entirely left out and Elwood is barely in the exhibition. Historic and more significant campaigns are ignored in this 'Picturing Democracy' exhibition?

#### Response:

*Council does not support the exclusion of any community. The exhibition was delivered under an artist led curatorial model, where expectations regarding inclusion were not explicitly defined in the brief. This has highlighted the importance of clearer frameworks to ensure Council's values are consistently reflected in future cultural programming.*

*The brief did not include specific requirements relating to multicultural representation. The exhibition met the artistic and technical requirements of the brief, including responding to the PHOTO 2026 theme and use of the City Collection.*

*The brief did not require representation of religious places or communities, and the exhibition was not intended as a commentary on religious inclusion. Council recognises, however, that absence can be experienced as exclusion and that this is an important consideration for future programming frameworks.*

*Content selection was at the discretion of the curator, who was not required to represent communities proportionally to Collection holdings. Council notes that clearer expectations around representation would provide stronger guidance in future projects.*

*As with other content areas, selection decisions rested with the curator and were not guided by demographic or representational criteria. Council recognises that this outcome has generated concern and reinforces the importance of clearer curatorial parameters.*

*The exhibition brief did not reference Council's declaration Stand in Solidarity Against Antisemitism, nor require those commitments to be reflected explicitly. This has highlighted the need for clearer alignment between Council statements and commissioned cultural activity.*

*The exhibition does not breach Council policy. However, the policy principles were not specifically embedded into the curatorial framework, and alignment was therefore not explicitly assessed during development.*

# RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

18 MARCH 2026



*Council does not believe the exhibition constitutes unlawful discrimination under the Act. The exhibition did not deny access to services, participation or rights, nor was it developed with discriminatory intent.*

*The brief did not require geographic representation across suburbs. Selection decisions were made based on artistic interpretation rather than location coverage, and the brief did not require comprehensive historical coverage. Council recognises that clearer scope parameters would assist future exhibitions.*

## **Item 10.1 Collaborative Procurement to New e-bike and e-scooter Agreement**

---

### **Question from Councillor Jay:**

Do we have any figures of fatalities or serious injuries that have occurred in the City of Port Phillip specifically with rental scooters?

### **Response:**

*Under their agreement with Council, operators are required to report incidents to Council. Council notes that this reporting relies on accurate information being received by the operators when the incidents occur. There have been no reported fatalities in Port Phillip on either e-bikes or e-scooters since this required reporting commenced in 2022.*

*Serious incidents refer to any incident that requires inpatient hospital treatment (e.g. fracture, concussion or surgery). There has been a total of 12 serious incidents reported since 2022 across both e-bikes and e-scooters for a total of 2.33 million trips in Port Phillip. In 2025 there was one serious injury reported by operators.*

Year	Fatalities	Serious	Total Trips	Per 100k Trips
2022	0	4	506,868	0.79
2023	0	5	676,381	0.74
2024	0	2	597,533	0.33
2025	0	1	554,270	0.18
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2,335,052</b>	<b>0.51</b>