

Response to the New Public Health Act

Compliance, trust, honesty and dreams or inspiration are the four (4) elements of importance of the human social being. The difficulty in tracking down this paper tested my trust and sense of honesty in the government's preparedness to gain a large public response. The document in toto conveys a mother hood (State) approach to manage and control children (regional Health personnel) without consideration for religious or ethnic populations by

- Shifting costs and conflict management onto rate payers.
- Driving a government agenda for change without giving people a democratic say at the 2006 polls.
- Passing to regions the problems of wellbeing of people in poor situations without the power to deal with their problem which includes work, income housing and education, whilst commercial enterprise operate unrestricted especially in moulding peoples unhealthy behaviour.

Regionalisations with CEO's of Councils, Water Authorities and DSE's soon to have health added seemingly is a State strategy for man management as 'herd' creature units being managed to be consumer producer units with minimal opportunities to dream or be inspired. Sadly it has the hallmarks of an open gulag of life in Russian States of the Stalin era. Choice and freedom to choose, especially now the anti-terrorist / sedition laws presently at the second reading in Parliament, will be denied. Forced compliance, loss of trust, and honesty will destroy dreams or inspiration of people. Confusion - re Section 1.4(6) - "be inclusive of physical and mental wellbeing" and Section 1.4(7) - "health to apply to all other provisions and be defined narrowly," to exclude concepts of social (Pina) ↗

Contd. 1

and mental well being.

If mental well being, a product of lost trust, honesty and dreams or inspiration to comply with and enjoy the norms of social life, isn't foundational in a health act, then this document has overtones more akin to treating people as herd animals.

The implications the "Act being bound to the Crown" 105 (10) with various prerogatives is daunting, unexplained and worrisome for it denies accessible social justice in any action to repeal any part or the whole act without social disquiet and or finance to meet a legal challenge. (ref Annotated Constitution of the Australian Constitution by Quick & Garran)

The question remains, "Will the ends justify the means" for the physical and psychological health of generations to come? I doubt it especially where regional differences will generate social and economic division

1