

#406

**COMPLETE**

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)

Started: Friday, October 17, 2014 3:17:01 AM

Last Modified: Friday, October 17, 2014 3:32:27 AM

Time Spent: 00:15:25

IP Address: 212.240.89.187

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.

Yes,

Please give your reasons for your response: If people really object to organ donation I think it is good to give them the opportunity to record this. By moving to an opt-out system people who strongly disagree will have this option. The current system only has 39% registered according to the Scottish Government. Yet I read somewhere that 90-odd% of people think organ donation is a good thing. So why is there only 39% registered? If we move to a soft-opt out we can get high numbers of people included in organ donation, if they really truly object to doing it they can then go online and de-register. Surely this just makes sense. I know if I needed an organ I'd want someone to donate it and therefore if I did in a situation where my organs can be donated then why shouldn't I donate, it's not like I am going to use them is it?

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?

I read in the evening times about a guy who needed a kidney. The report said 3 people a day die waiting on an organ. That is ludicrous. That's over 1000 people a year die because there aren't enough organs. Surely there are people dying every day in situations where their organs can be donated. It is horrible to think about your death, or your families death however if I was to die today, or my loved ones were to pass away I'd like to think that their death can give life to someone.

I am a registered organ donor and so is my wife. We both know that if one of us were to die and we could donate we would. So why is only 39% of people register by 90-odd% support it? Have they just not got round to signing-up yet? It is easy for people to say I agree and I'll sign-up later, but if later never comes then that puts puts family members in a hard position should anything happen to you.

Far too many people are dying in need of an organ for us just to say lets try and encourage more people to sign-up. The public agrees, it is there in black and white, yet they still don't sign-up. People are more likely to act if the object to something, so let people have the right to de-register, it isn't going to be huge numbers. If the current figures are right we'd get 10% people max de-registering that's still a 50% increase in what the Scottish Government have managed.

What I have heard about soft-opt out is that lots of countries use, Scotland is behind the times, we are letting people die needlessly for what? Just make the change

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.

Yes,

Please give reasons for your response:
I think families shouldn't have the final say, of course they should be consulted, told what is happening and taken through the process. They should be told what organs were able to be used and informed that they have helped save someones life. I wouldn't like to think that a son wanted to donate if he dad but a mum was able to over rule this because she believed it was wrong. I think the change would encourage families to explore this part of life, after all the only inevitability in life is death and taxes. So why shouldn't we talk about it. I have had the conversation with my family it only makes sense.

Q4: Do you think an individual should be able to appoint a proxy to the 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:
I think you should yes. If your family strongly objects to your wishes how can you trust them to carry through after your death? I think appointing a legal proxy is fair and would ensure that your choice in life is carried through after death. I am sure Jack would want Victor to be his proxy (or vise-versa) or would he want the hospital to phone his daughter in Toronto?

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.

Yes,

Please give reasons for your response:
This makes sense

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.

Yes,

If you answered no, what would you consider a more appropriate age?
I think this is sensible it is the age that we are all deemed to be adult

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.

Yes

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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

Respondent skipped this question

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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

Respondent skipped this question

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.

Anonymous

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

