

U09d1 sarah and michael case study



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

As seen in the case Sarah and Michael have has numerous talks for their wish for the last days of their lives. Their daughter Kate has the interest of her parents in mind when she decides that they deserve to live a normal life until their death and it is worth the effort to try and keep them alive with the help of the new technologies and science that has been invented. She is right to argue that science has been growing continuously and there could possibly be a solution that could be devised to help remove the prostate cancer. Although the intention is good, there is a conflict on interest in the case as the couple have already decided how they would prefer to spend their last days and it is a personal will rather than one forced by others. It is also clear by law that an individual has the rights to make a decision for how they aim to spend their last few days. This is one of the few issues that have been presented in the case.

Secondly, the end - of - life directive enables the medical assistance to discuss the wish of the parents with the children. This however is a major issue as the cases are generally very sensitive and discussing this with the children can prove to be very difficult. This is mainly because the amount of stress, trauma and emotional distress that children and family members go through when an elderly person is ill is very high. Hence it would be difficult for the health care providers to convey the news as well as the family members to hear the news of the will of the parents. This again causes a second of ethics in the case (Garrett, Baillie, & Garrett, 2009).

Considering the end of life decision in my life or for someone I know, I feel that it is incorrect to allow anyone to take the decision to end the life of others. This is inappropriate and is completely inhuman. A person should be given the right to live as long as they can and as long as their body is able to

accept the life. Using technology to keep a person alive or trying to kill a person against the flow of nature is not right and should not be accepted anywhere in the world. Life is given to all and mercy killing is not ethical in any manner and should not be permitted. Giving an end - of - life decision for someone irrespective of whether it is a mother or father of brother or sister is incorrect and is against the law of nature. Hence it is essential that this is not provided as an option ever as according to the ACA code of Ethics it has clearly been presented that, ' counsellors must strive to take measures that enable clients to receive complete and adequate assessment regarding their ability to make competent, rational decisions on their own behalf from a mental health professional who is experienced in end-of-life care practice'. Hence the decision to live or to die should be in the hands of the individuals and no attempts should ever be made to go against the law of nature (Alexandria, 2005).

References

- Alexandria, V. A. (2005). Code of ethics. American Counseling Association.
- Garrett, T. M., Baillie, H. M., & Garrett, R. M. (2009). Health Care Ethics: Principles and Problems (5th Edition). Prentice Hall.