

Is The Health Department Stacking The Deck In Their Favour?

The Illusion of Choice.

It is easy to think that you have a choice about what happens and also that your opinion counts. The reality might be different. The response document seems designed to build consensus for the outcome the Health Department knows will happen.

Have you been given a choice as to how your public health law will be so dramatically changed? No!

You are then told this is not about health promotion. You are told that would be contentious and time consuming without being told why and how!

Do we not have an integrated health care system where promoting health is equally, if not more important than protection? Yes!

The choice on these starting points has already been decided, with us being urged, if not rushed, to agree to the urgency of this legislative framework otherwise tragedy will ensue because we are vulnerable.

Do you really have a meaningful choice on what will happen when you take a second closer look at multiple choice answers and comments option? Questionable at best!

There seems to be a deliberate attempt to steer you away from thinking about what actually is the important issue or at the very least not bringing it to your attention. The factual point they ask the questions on is, often, not the most relevant one. It seems someone has already decided that the important fact is going to happen anyway. Often you will find it referenced in the issues leading up to the question as an established fact which you weren't asked about, e.g.,

Questions 1 and 2, don't seem to ask about two of the most important issues. Question 1 doesn't ask if it's necessary to include a set of objectives and question 2, if it is ok to have already decided upon the concept of 'all hazards'.

Has the Health Department really aligned themselves with the overarching principle of fairness in consultations? Surely they could have saturated the public sphere with alerts to these proposals. Then, as a starting point, ask if you agreed that a public consultation of such magnitude to society, they say they want to protect, is the right way to go.

They didn't why? It seems odd not to give you that choice.