



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

SELECT COMMITTEE ON END OF LIFE CHOICES IN THE ACT

Ms Bec Cody MLA (Chair), Mrs Vicki Dunne MLA (Deputy Chair), Ms Tara Cheyne MLA,
Mrs Elizabeth Kikkert MLA, Ms Caroline Le Couteur MLA.

Submission Cover Sheet

End of Life Choices in the ACT

Submission Number: 49

Date Authorised for Publication: 29/3/18

From: Phillip Stuckey
To: [LA Committee - EOLC](#)
Subject: Inquiry into End of Life Choices in the ACT
Date: Saturday, 3 February 2018 7:32:16 PM

Richard W. Stuckey, Phillip Stuckey

██████████
Moorabbin, Vic 3189

Phone: (03) ██████████

3 Feb 2018

Secretary,
Select Committee on End of Life Choices in the ACT,
Legislative Assembly for the ACT,
GPO Box 1020,
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dear Secretary,

We are writing to say that we are gravely concerned about the "option" of legally terminating human life. We do not need or want to be subjected to the "suggestion" that it would be better for others and us, if we were not around any more. This would be very offensive and hurtful – particularly at a very vulnerable time in our lives. Yet this is what is proposed.

People like to be agreeable; it takes effort to disagree with any suggestion. "Would you like fries with that?" is a suggestion, not just an offer, meant to increase sales. Being offered the option to be euthanized will have the psychological effect of a suggestion, and it will take energy to oppose; sick people need support to regain health, not someone they need to oppose.

If you are young and healthy (i.e. don't really need a doctor), you won't expect any "offers" to euthanize; but, the more you need to see the doctor, the more likely you will be to get an "offer". So now, added to the fear of getting a bad diagnosis as you get older (and sicker), you will face the specter of being flagged as "nonviable"! Who is going to want to visit the doctor, knowing that you may be flagged for termination; but hey, THAT COULD SAVE A LOT OF MONEY!!! Like Ebenezer Scrooge, in the famous *A Christmas Carol*, who would like to "reduce the surplus population", we think that is at least part of the real aim here: to reduce excess population.

From my perspective, palliative care is already implemented "assisted dying" - and this is being hidden from the population in general, but not from the medical community. As soon as you are placed on "palliative care", all medical assistance is withdrawn, and every opportunity to accelerate your death is taken – like morphine injections. So those who want "assistance in dying" can already get it, and there are medical staff very willing to give that assistance.

Euthanasia laws are directed at those who DO NOT WANT to be euthanized. It will give legal cover to medical staff who want to be more pro-active in suggesting euthanasia to those who may be resisting: it gives them cover over accusations of malpractice (and potentially murder). Euthanasia laws also remove the protection to medical staff who do

not want to partake in legal murder; they will have more pressure to leave the profession.

Also, it is apparent that there is a hatred for freedom of religion (particularly Judeo-Christian beliefs). It appears that those who espouse passing Euthanasia laws judge viability as a mathematical equation. After all, surely “viability” will be non-subjective; perhaps it will be an Artificial Intelligence system with “black box” maths. If it is subjective, perhaps it will be a “viability panel” (as is probably already practised at institutions like Peter Mac in Victoria, to determine who gets “selected” for palliative care). It seems that is the ethic they espouse, and they don’t have time for anyone else who believes there is more to life: *if you don’t want to be subjected to a viability evaluation, don’t use medical facilities; and if you don’t want to partake in patient viability evaluation, get out of the medical profession.*

Euthanasia laws are an attack on the religious freedom of those who will not yet partake in proactive termination of human life. It does not really change the ability of those who want to be euthanized from being euthanized; but what it probably means is that, if you do not agree with them, you will be guilty of a “hate crime”, since they will expect you to “celebrate” their euthanasia.

To pass Euthanasia laws will not make the problems associated with being unwell go away. It will make the problems worse, because institutionalizing promotion of euthanasia is unjust and immoral.

Yours Sincerely,

Richard W. Stuckey

Phillip Stuckey