

The Joker in the Pack – All Hazards!

Would you consent to live in a world where anything and everything may be labeled a harm? Take a closer look, you might just find that your consent to this is not being asked.

Questions 1 – 5 deal only with such things as the bill intent and definitions. Question 5 only asks about the notification approach for this great idea of all hazards, not the actual concept that it is. The foreword and background introduce it and what makes it up e.g., environmental and chemical. This is entirely new.

What's the thinking behind saying all of our reality will be classed as a harm they will try to keep away from us when they decide to. They say we are now vulnerable to these and if we don't agree and co-operate they are going to control our lives, use their powers to force us to submit as they deem necessary.

Traditionally, both the health and criminal justice system identify harmful acts or incidences, e.g. vaping, stalking or diseases then create protections, e.g. legislation. Now instead of that, you are being urged to set aside naming harms in favour of agreeing everything can be a harm. Thereafter, rather than make laws that outlaw harmful acts or deal with specific incidences, grant permanent enormous powers allowing absolute freedom for restrictions and interventions in your work and family life not to mention your own body all to keep you safe.

Is this not disregarding generations of learning through experience to keep us safe? The Health Department themselves rely upon this very standard themselves when they say that social and environmental conditions, when poor, contribute to a higher incidence of and increased risk to, e.g. childhood infections, such as measles. Society has learned the importance, therefore, in good sewerage, clean water, effective waste management, warm homes, nutritious food.

The health Department can't have it both ways! If they are now saying this new great idea of all hazards is the way to go won't that mean that you as a parent may no longer have the final say or choice on your child's health protective measures. Is this not riding a coach and horses through the legal protections of informed consent?

Once you see it you can't unsee it, can you? The concept of all hazards has been slipped in, has it not? The meaning and implications hasn't been explained, has it? You haven't been asked to agree to this new big idea, have you? Is it important to keep your power in this? What are you willing to do to keep it? Respond on what you see, if you disagree, why you object and don't consent.