Annex E: Consultation Questions

The consultation sets out a number of proposed amendments. Views are invited on the following:

1) Where data relating to a citizen is held it should be accurate.
Do you agree that the approach suggested at paragraphs 9-11 is an effective approach to achieving this?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If No, please describe the approach you feel should be taken.

| Effective? Yes, the approach would probably yield “accurate” information. The question, to me, is whether the citizen should consent to having his every move clocked and tracked by an unspecified number of state and civil agencies, including NGOs and lawyers. The legislation would, if approved, open the door to increased “monitoring” of citizens by the state. It is not possible at this time to predict all the uses to which such information would be put, nor would the proposed measures allow for adequate oversight, by citizens, of the information held by the state. However reasonably stated in the consultation document, this proposal remains too vague in allowing for future applications of the law which might not, in the end, prove to be benign. |

2) We propose to extend the current ability to trace persons a) who go missing whilst in education and b) who should pay for treatment provided by the NHS.
Do you agree with these proposal set out in paragraphs 12-13?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If No please explain why not?

| The sharing of information on Scots with English authorities is not something that could be rescinded. The monitoring of its own citizens by the English state is already conducted with a zeal that Scots are not currently subjected to. While it would certainly be desirable to trace children who go missing in the education system, and also people who try to slide out of paying their way for NHS treatment, it escapes me how having access to NHS address information is likely to facilitate this outcome, as “going missing” in such a case is likely to be intentional and the “missing” person unlikely to be updating his contact information with the NHS. |

3) In order to allow citizens to make use myaccount for a wider group of services (beyond health and local government), as set out in paragraphs 14-16, we propose to provide access to the bodies named in draft Schedule 3 (Annex B).
Are there any additional service providers who you feel should be included?

| Of course citizens should have access to all the bodies named in draft Schedule 3 (Annex B). But rather than such bodies having prior access to all information of record about a citizen before he contacts – or even knows he needs to contact – such a body, it should remain the choice of the citizen as to what information he shares with the body in question. If they are to engage in the democratic process as thoughtful members of a civil society, citizens need to feel that they retain some control of their own personal details, which is to say, that they are adults with the power of choice. While the proposed procedures might be capable of implementation as a “system”, and might work in many respects, they will have the effect of further reducing the citizen to a number, and for that reason they are creepy. We do not need Big Brother. Things are creepy enough already. |

4) Do you consider that the proposals set out in paragraph 18 are an effective method to identify Scottish Taxpayers?
Yes □ No □

If No please describe the approach you feel should be taken.
