

#190

**COMPLETE**

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)

Started: Thursday, September 04, 2014 6:24:26 AM

Last Modified: Thursday, September 04, 2014 7:03:34 AM

Time Spent: 00:39:08

IP Address: 217.39.81.237

PAGE 2: Proposed Organ and Tissue Donation (Scotland) Bill Consultation

Q1: The overarching purpose of my proposal is to move from the current opt-in system to a soft opt-out system of organ donation. Do you support this move? Please indicate "yes/no/undecided" and explain the reasons for your response.

No,

Please give your reasons for your response: People who are undecided may be deemed as having opted in. The conversation of whether or not to donate is not always discussed between family members - therefore someone who may have not wished to donate but has never spoken out about their wishes may be deemed by pro donation relatives to have wished his or her organs to be donated.

Q2: How essential is it to change the law (from an opt-in to a soft opt-out system) in order to achieve the intended benefits (increased transplant rates, reduced waiting lists)? Are there other (non-legislative) measures that could achieve similar outcomes without the need for legislation?

It is not essential to change the law and neither should it be seen to be something for which it is necessary to have legislation imposing an action for which the a potential donors explicit consent has not been granted. There is a serious danger of getting carried away with altruistic wishes to help those in need of donation without ensuring informed donor consent.

Non legislative measures would be a far preferable option - a government lead campaign to encourage GPs, and Hospital staff to ask Patients about donation when they access these services for any other reason. This would be preferable and morally acceptable than legally mandating any implied consent without the absolute certainty of the true wishes of any potential donor.

Q3: I believe the role of the family should be limited to being consulted on whether they are aware of any (unregistered) objection by the deceased rather than asking for their consent. Do you agree? Please indicate "yes/no/undecided" and explain the reasons for your response.

No,

Please give reasons for your response: Limiting discussion with families is insulting to them at a time of grief. In my opinion it is nothing short of abominable conceit to imagine that any right to override a families opinion exists especially at a time when they are bereft of a loved one. If the potential donor has not indicated their wishes clearly to family members or holds a donor card the subject should be closed - unless the family specifically wish donation to take place without any dissent among the members.

Q4: Do you think an individual should be able to appoint a proxy to make the final decision regarding transplantation on their behalf? Please indicate "yes/no/undecided" and explain the reasons for your response.

Yes,

Please give reasons for your response:
If when sound of mind and with full information a person feels that he/she wishes to give the right to another sound of mind person the ability to make that specific decision for them then there is no reason why this should not be granted

Q5: My proposal is that only adults should be automatically opted-in to be a donor. Younger persons would have to register to be a donor, by themselves or with parental consent as they currently do. This approach is I believe the best way to safeguard children and young people. Do you agree? Please indicate "yes/no/undecided" and explain the reasons for your response.

No,

Please give reasons for your response:
As I have stated above I do not agree with an automatically opted in method. The risk of carrying out harvesting of organs on a person who would never have consented to it is too horrifying to contemplate. It is abhorrent to me that this would even seem appropriate.

Q6: Do you agree the age limit for an adult should be set at 16 years old? Please indicate "yes/no/undecided" and explain the reasons for your response.

No,

If you answered no, what would you consider a more appropriate age?
At 16yrs old most people feel that they know it all and have the fullest information and life experience to make radical life altering choices which given 20yrs hence when they are 26yrs old they hold VERY different opinions on. At 16 I do not believe it is possible to understand the omnity of what you are signing. As I have stated above I do not agree with an automatically opted in method. The risk of carrying out harvesting of organs on a person who would never have consented to it is too horrifying to contemplate. It is abhorrent to me that this would even seem appropriate.

Q7: Do you agree the soft opt-out system should apply to people who have been resident in Scotland for a minimum period of 1 year prior to their death? Please indicate "yes/no/undecided" and explain the reasons for your response.

No,

Please give reasons for your response:
As I have stated above I do not agree with an automatically opted in method. The risk of carrying out harvesting of organs on a person who would never have consented to it is too horrifying to contemplate. It is abhorrent to me that this would even seem appropriate. In addition one persons definition of what "soft" means I the context of an opt -out system may be considerable different from anothers.

Q8: If you answered no to the above how long, if any, should this period of residency last before they become subject to the soft opt-out system? Would this residency need to be for a continuous period?

As I have stated above I do not agree with an automatically opted in method. The risk of carrying out harvesting of organs on a person who would never have consented to it is too horrifying to contemplate. It is abhorrent to me that this would even seem appropriate.

Q9: Do you think 6 months is a long enough period to run a campaign prior to change over?

As I have stated above I do not agree with an automatically opted in method. The risk of carrying out harvesting of organs on a person who would never have consented to it is too horrifying to contemplate. It is abhorrent to me that this would even seem appropriate.

Q10: What is your assessment of the likely financial implications (if any) of the proposed Bill to you or your organisation? What (if any) other significant financial implications are likely to arise?

As I have stated above I do not agree with an automatically opted in method. The risk of carrying out harvesting of organs on a person who would never have consented to it is too horrifying to contemplate. It is abhorrent to me that this would even seem appropriate.

Q11: Is the proposed Bill likely to have any substantial positive or negative implications for equality? If it is likely to have a substantial negative implication, how might this be minimised or avoided?

As I have stated above I do not agree with an automatically opted in method. The risk of carrying out harvesting of organs on a person who would never have consented to it is too horrifying to contemplate. It is abhorrent to me that this would even seem appropriate.

Q12: Do you have any other comments on or suggestions relevant to the proposal?

As I have stated above I do not agree with an automatically opted in method. The risk of carrying out harvesting of organs on a person who would never have consented to it is too horrifying to contemplate. It is abhorrent to me that this would even seem appropriate.

PAGE 3: Contact Details

Q13: If you wish your response, or any part of it, to be treated as anonymous and/or confidential, please check the appropriate box. If not, then please go to question 14.

Respondent skipped this question

Q14: Thank you for completing this survey. Please provide your name and contact details below.

Name

Company

Address

Address 2

City/Town

State/Province

ZIP/Postal Code

Country

Email Address

