228. C Fairweather

Full name: C Fairweather

Proposal 2–1

Yes

Proposal 2–2

Yes

Proposal 3–1

Yes

Proposal 3–2

Yes but.  Though an older person may refuse help, this could be out of fear or misunderstanding.  If the abuser is the primary carer the older person may feel that they are putting themselves at further risk of greater abuse or "punishment" is they accept help.  Once a person has signed away all decision making rights even if they are in fact still able to make decisions they have no power to make one.  This must not be overlooked. How, with this in mind do you determine (c)

Proposal 3–3

Yes

Proposal 3–4

Yes

Proposal 3–5

Yes

Proposal 5–1

Yes.  This is critical.  I also think EPOAs and Guardianship papers should be mandated for all with dementia

Proposal 5–2

Yes

Proposal 5–3

Yes

Question 5–1

Everyone.  Privacy does not server the best interests of those with dementia. Privacy protects abusers, and from my observation a person with dementia in a care facility has no privacy anyway.

Question 5–2

Yes

Proposal 5–4

Yes.  But I believe the second signator should have known the principal for a year or more, though this might be hard to implement in some case in which case it should go for review to the public guardianship body.  In my personal experience, concerned family members were deliberately omitted from the decision making process, and then refused access to authorising documents. At the same time, access to the principal was also restricted by the agent.  There appeared to be nothing we could do about this.

Proposal 5–5

Yes

Proposal 5–6

I like this, but again, in my experience, the person being abused would not have forseen the abuse, and was definitely constrained by their relationship to the carer/agent

Proposal 5–7

Yes  - the last seems complicated.  If the carer/agent is spouse to the principal how would this work?  I like the idea that the EPOA agent and guardian are two different people.  I imagine this would be hard to implement.

Proposal 5–8

Yes

Proposal 5–9

Yes.  Who will be entitled to have access to those records?

Proposal 5–10

Yes

Proposal 5–11

Sounds good.

Proposal 5–12

Yes.  But suggest short and long form versions rather than multiple choice on one form.

Proposal 5–13

Yes

Proposal 6–1

Yes

Question 6–1

(A)

Proposal 6–2

Yes (I thought this was built into the EPOA and Guardianship papers)

Question 6–2

Can's answer this

Question 6–3

They should have a choice of a second person to be involved.  This would help, though I can see how it could be circumvented.  It would add another layer of prevention.

Proposal 7–1

Yes

Proposal 7–2

Yes

Question 7–1

Don't have the knowledge to respond to this.

Question 7–2

Don't have the knowledge to respond to this.

Proposal 8–1

Yes

Question 8–1

Yes

Proposal 9–1

Yes

Proposal 9–2

Don't have the knowledge to respond to this.

Proposal 9–3

Yes

Proposal 10–1

Yes

Proposal 10–2

Yes

Proposal 10–3

Yes

Proposal 10–4

Yes

Proposal 11–1

Yes

Proposal 11–2

Yes

Proposal 11–3

Yes

Proposal 11–4

Yes

Proposal 11–5

Yes

Question 11–1

Don't have the knowledge to respond to this.

Question 11–2

Don't have the knowledge to respond to this.

Question 11–3

Don't have the knowledge to respond to this.

Proposal 11–6

Sounds good

Proposal 11–7

Yes

Proposal 11–8

Not sure.  Do not recall any "discussion" on this.

Proposal 11–9

Yes

Proposal 11–10

Yes

Proposal 11–11

Yes

File