

Assisted Dying for Terminally Ill Adults (Scotland) Bill

Introduction

A proposal for a Bill to enable competent adults who are terminally ill to be provided at their request with assistance to end their life.

The consultation runs from 23 September 2021 to 22 December 2021.

All those wishing to respond to the consultation are strongly encouraged to enter their responses electronically through this survey. This makes collation of responses much simpler and quicker. However, the option also exists of sending in a separate response (in hard copy or by other electronic means such as e-mail), and details of how to do so are included in the member's consultation document.

Questions marked with an asterisk (*) require an answer.

All responses must include a name and contact details. Names will only be published if you give us permission, and contact details are never published – but we may use them to contact you if there is a query about your response. If you do not include a name and/or contact details, we may have to disregard your response.

Please note that you must complete the survey in order for your response to be accepted. If you don't wish to complete the survey in a single session, you can choose "Save and Continue later" at any point. Whilst you have the option to skip particular questions, you must continue to the end of the survey and press "Submit" to have your response fully recorded.

Please ensure you have read the consultation document before responding to any of the questions that follow. In particular, you should read the information contained in the document about how your response will be handled. The consultation document is available here:

[Consultation Document](#)

[Privacy Notice](#)

I confirm that I have read and understood the Privacy Notice attached to this consultation which explains how my personal data will be used.

On the previous page we asked you if you are UNDER 12 YEARS old, and you responded Yes to this question.

If this is the case, we will have to contact your parent or guardian for consent.

If you are under 12 years of age, please put your contact details into the textbox. This can be your email address or phone number. We will then contact you and your parents to receive consent.

Otherwise please confirm that you are or are not under 12 years old.

No Response

About you

Please choose whether you are responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation.
Note: If you choose "individual" and consent to have the response published, it will appear under your own name. If you choose "on behalf of an organisation" and consent to have the response published, it will be published under the organisation's name.

an individual

Which of the following best describes you? (If you are a professional or academic, but not in a subject relevant to the consultation, please choose "Member of the public".)

Member of the public

Please select the category which best describes your organisation

No Response

Please choose one of the following:

I am content for this response to be published and attributed to me or my organisation

Please provide your Full Name or the name of your organisation. (Note: the name will not be published if you have asked for the response to be anonymous or "not for publication". Otherwise this is the name that will be published with your response).

Logan Fisher

Please provide details of a way in which we can contact you if there are queries regarding your response. Email is preferred but you can also provide a postal address or phone number.

We will not publish these details.

Aim and Approach - Note: All answers to the questions in this section may be published (unless your response is "not for publication").

Q1. Which of the following best expresses your view of the proposed Bill?

Fully opposed

Please explain the reasons for your response.

Man, being a rational animal, has an intellect and free will. By his intellect, he may deduce certain religious and moral truths with complete certainty, e.g. the existence of God and the natural law. Let us consider the natural law. Now insofar as thing exists, it is good. And insofar as a thing is good it is desirable. Therefore the first precept of the natural law, is that good be pursued and evil avoided. Now the first principle that the

Q1. Which of the following best expresses your view of the proposed Bill?

intellect apprehends is being and non-being. From this it deduces that existence is good and non-existence not good. From these it necessarily follows that man is good insofar as he exists and that his nature ought to be preserved. Therefore whatever is a means of preserving human life, and of warding off its obstacles, belongs to the natural law. (St. Thomas Aquinas)

It follows from this that under natural law, man is absolutely prohibited from killing himself or others who are innocent. Now since an illness does not impute guilt to anyone, least of all to the one afflicted, to murder him is to unjustly kill him. The same is true if that man were to murder himself (=commit suicide). Therefore it is never licit to commit suicide, since it violates the most fundamental instinct of man, that is, to live. Less so then, is it licit to become a formal party to the crime of suicide by assisting him to commit it.

This principle has been recognised by all races throughout all ages. Only a monstrous pride and impiety towards our fathers would suggest otherwise. Let us consider the Hippocratic Oath: "Neither will I administer a poison to anybody when asked to do so, nor will I suggest such a course."

Furthermore, suicide and murder are prohibited by the fifth commandment of God, which is nothing other than an enumeration of natural law. It states, "thou shalt not kill." i.e. murder. It does not say, "thou shalt kill another," but only "thou shalt not kill." Therefore suicide and assisting it is prohibited by divine commandment, which no civil authority may ignore, for all governments are bound by natural law to acknowledge the one God and his revealed truths.

Moreover, as a rational creature, man is first bound to know and love God his Creator. Second, he is bound to love his neighbour as himself. Now, to commit suicide is firstly a grave crime against almighty God; a mortal sin. It is an act of enormous pride, usurping the rights of God, who alone "has the power of life and death." (Wisdom 16.13) And to formally (with knowledge and consent) assist a man in suicide is equally as sinful in the eyes of God. For man's continued existence each moment is a gift from God. It is apparent to all, that man does not contain the principle of his existence within him, in the language of the philosophers – man's essence is distinct from his existence. i.e. what I am (essence – a man), does not necessarily entail that I exist. Thus every moment I must be preserved in existence by a God, whose essence is his existence – the First Cause. "How could any thing endure, if thou wouldst not? or be preserved, if not called by thee?" (Wisdom 11.26)

Suicide (and formal co-operation in it) is a grave sin against the precept to love one's neighbour as oneself. This is obvious to all men, even little children. How can I love my neighbour if I am murdering him? Some may object, saying, "Ah but he consents, therefore it is licit." Let us reply by saying that it is no more licit to murder a man if he consents, than it is to enslave a man if he consents. Suicide and co-operation with it is a completely selfish act, it shows nothing but contempt towards one's friends and relatives who deeply care about him, least of all his own parents who gave birth to him and raised him.

What neglect would the civil power be guilty of if it did not direct its citizens to their final end, which is the vision of God? No ruler, whether he be elected or not, can co-operate in passing this bill. This would constitute formal co-operation with murder and a further attack on human dignity, whose immortal soul is made in the image of God. All MSPs, MPs or monarchs have the duty to resist this bill and to refuse to enforce it if it passes.

Lastly, assisted suicide is an act of despair, whereby man turns away from the truth about God, namely, that he has promised us eternal happiness if we persevere. (Revelation 2.10) It is always a mortal sin. St. Paul exhorts us to look to his Son, Jesus, "who having joy set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and now sitteth on the right hand of the throne of God." (Hebrews 12.2) and again, "the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come, that shall be revealed in us," (Romans 8.18) that is, the glory of beatitude in heaven after death. To commit suicide means you reject the suffering God only permitted in this short life so that we could merit heaven in the next life, which is without end.

Q2. Do you think legislation is required, or are there other ways in which the Bill's aims could be achieved more effectively? Please explain the reasons for your response.

All legislation attempting to legalise murder (assisted suicide) must be abandoned.

Q3. Which of the following best expresses your view of the proposed process for assisted dying as set out at section 3.1 in the consultation document (Step 1 - Declaration, Step 2 - Reflection period, Step 3 - Prescribing/delivering)?

Fully opposed

Please explain the reasons for your response, including if you think there should be any additional measures, or if any of the existing proposed measures should be removed. In particular, we are keen to hear views on Step 2 - Reflection period, and the length of time that is most appropriate. Even if the "reflection period" was a quadrillion years, it assisted suicide would still be murder and grave crime, which the civil power must prevent. The moral law is immutable, as are the laws of physics and mathematics. C.f. response to Q1.

Q4. Which of the following best expresses your views of the safeguards proposed in section 1.1 of the consultation document?

Fully opposed

Please explain the reasons for your response.

Number of safeguards irrelevant. If my wife consents to me committing adultery it still violates natural law, as I already promised her complete fidelity.

Q5. Which of the following best expresses your view of a body being responsible for reporting and collecting data?

Fully opposed

Please explain the reasons for your response, including whether you think this should be a new or existing body (and if so, which body) and what data you think should be collected.

N/A see previous responses.

Q6. Please provide comment on how a conscientious objection (or other avenue to ensure voluntary participation by healthcare professionals) might best be facilitated.

From Section 3.3: Conscience: "It is important that doctors and other healthcare professionals are able to conscientiously object (CO) to supporting their patients through an assisted dying request." This type of language is absolutely abominable. How am I "supporting my patient" if I agree to murder him with his consent? By this insidious language, it is implied that it is the doctor who refuses to murder his patient that is wrong and a bad doctor; while a "true, good" doctor would have assented to his patient's request to murder him. It assumes that the default is murdering your patient when he asks you, and to not do so is abnormal. This type of attack on language and re-defining words is exactly how evil tries to make itself tolerable to the ear: murdering my patient becomes "supporting" him. But some truths are true independent of who assents or who does not. 2+2 does not cease to be 4 if no one thinks so. Worse still, these heroic doctors who refuse to become hit men paid for by tax-payers are treated as criminals and put on a register, just as sex offenders. How grievous an injustice! A nation where innocent life is not protected and ill people are told that their lives are worthless is a failed state, as if Jesus Christ did not redeem all men by his blood, making all lives worthwhile, where both the rulers and subjects only care for pleasure and money.

Financial Implications

Q7. Taking into account all those likely to be affected (including public sector bodies, businesses and individuals etc), is the proposed Bill likely to lead to:

don't know

Please indicate where you would expect the impact identified to fall (including public sector bodies, businesses and individuals etc). You may also wish to suggest ways in which the aims of the Bill could be delivered more cost-effectively.

Makes no difference if this bill paid off the whole national debt in a year. No amount of money justifies the killing of an innocent human being.

Equalities

Q8. What overall impact is the proposed Bill likely to have on equality, taking account of the following protected characteristics (under the Equality Act 2010): age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation?

Unsure

Sustainability

Q9. In terms of assessing the proposed Bill's potential impact on sustainable development, you may wish to consider how it relates to the following principles:

- living within environmental limits
- ensuring a strong, healthy and just society
- achieving a sustainable economy
- promoting effective, participative systems of governance
- ensuring policy is developed on the basis of strong scientific evidence.

With these principles in mind, do you consider that the Bill can be delivered sustainably?

Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response.

N/A

General

Q10. Do you have any other additional comments or suggestions on the proposed Bill (which have not already been covered in any of your responses to earlier questions)?

No.