

Proposed Bill to abolish charges for non-residential social care

Page 2: About you

Please provide your name and other contact details. Please provide at least one means of contacting you (address, e-mail or telephone) - e-mail is our preferred option. (NB: you will be given the option shortly to specify whether it is your name or your organisation's name that is to be used, and you may also request anonymity or confidentiality for your response.)

Your name (mandatory)

Name of your organisation (if applicable - otherwise leave blank)

Your Job Title (if applicable - otherwise leave blank)

Contact details (please provide at least one of: email, telephone number, postal address) (mandatory)

Please indicate below whether you are content for your response to be attributed to you by name (either your name or that of your organisation)

I would like my response to be anonymous (the response may be published, but no name)

Page 4: Your comments on the proposal

Q1: Do you support the principle that non-residential social care services should be available free at the point of delivery to those who have been assessed by a relevant professional as requiring them (as is the case within health care)?

Yes

Please explain your answer

Many people are incapable of managing their financial affairs despite a 'statement of need'. This would redress the problem if it were free at the outset .

Q2. Do you agree that legislation is a necessary and appropriate means of addressing the issues identified?

Yes

Please explain the reasons for your response

If legislation were not in place, many authorities would simply fail to provide the service. It has to be a MANDATORY requirement.

Q3. The current system has resulted in varying charges in different areas for the same level and quality of service. Do you agree that there should be consistency across Scotland?

Q3. The current system has resulted in varying charges in different areas for the same level and quality of service. Do you agree that there should be consistency across Scotland?

Yes

What do you think the advantages and disadvantages would be?

There are crazy anomalies where IDENTICAL service is being provided to clients who are being charged at differing ratessome living just yards away from a boundary. 'Touchbase' in Kinning Park is a prime example of this, where G.C.C. have held a gun to the provider's head....(Sense Scotland) and refused to pay the 'going rate'. Sense has surrendered to this blatant blackmail in the interests of their clients and also to their continuing existence. People living outside Glasgow pay a higher rate ,and those living in Glasgow have been forced into paying for their own meals in order to redress the balance . It would be interesting to legally test the legality of this discrimination in a European court, if not Scotland.

Q4. Should all social care related services be free at the point of delivery?

Undecided

If you answered Yes, please explain your reasons. If you answered No, please explain which services should be excluded, and why. (Please refer to the services set out on page 7 of the consultation document).

This would be the ideal scenario but there will inevitably be individuals who don't always fit the full criteria. A level of discretion and flexibility should be adopted. The idea that one size fits all is an anathema to those in the disabled community.

Q5. What are 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?

If implemented it would HUGELY simplify the financial arrangements for most.

SDS is excellent for those able to operate the system but proves arduous ,if not impossible to many. It would be fairer and far less anomalous than at present.

It would also be much simpler and cheaper for a L.A. to implement.

It would provide a degree of security to carers knowing that provision would always be there.....even when they were not.

Q6. What do you think the implications of the proposed Bill are for equality? If it is likely to have a substantial negative implication, how might this be minimised or avoided?

Positive

Please explain your answer. If you answered Negative, please suggest any ways this impact could be minimised or avoided.

A coherent , simplified version of what is available at the moment would be enormously cost effective . In theory , by removing the bureaucracy and unnecessary administrative work currently required, it COULD provide more funding for day care services and generate jobs for care assistants. Clearly, an ageing population will simply increase this need in the years to come.

Q7. Are there any other comments you would wish to make that are relevant to this proposal?

Q7. Are there any other comments you would wish to make that are relevant to this proposal?

My greatest concern is the sheer waste of current resources. For almost 30 years (as a parent of 2 disabled sons) , I've witnessed this more than most.

This bill has the potential to redress the inequity amongst those most in need not merely those who shout loudest.....or politicians wishing to capitalise on a vote winning issue.

My fear is the capabilities of those charged with implementing such a proposal.