



Australian  
**CareAlliance**

*“Care and Compassion: Opposing Assisted Suicide.”*

## **Submission to the University of Tasmania’s Independent Review of the *End-of-Life Choices (Voluntary Assisted Dying) Bill 2020***

**From the Australian Care Alliance, prepared by Richard Egan**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Any proposal to change the law on murder and on instigating and aiding suicide by exempting doctors who prescribe and/or administer lethal poison to a specified category of persons requires the most careful scrutiny.

How will such a scheme avoid wrongful deaths? How will such a scheme guarantee a humane, rapid and peaceful death?

The evidence cited in this submission, drawn principally from official reports from jurisdictions such as the Netherlands, Belgium, Oregon and Washington State shows conclusively that no such scheme has yet been found.

For a full analysis of all eighteen jurisdictions where assisted suicide and/or euthanasia have been legalised see our publication [Fatally Flawed Experiments](#).<sup>1</sup>

For further information on wrongful deaths see our publication [Twelve Categories of Wrongful Death](#).<sup>2</sup>

It is the considered position of the Australian Care Alliance, based on a review of all the available evidence, that none of the jurisdictions that have legalised euthanasia and/or assisted suicide have succeeded in establishing a genuinely safe framework for assisted suicide and euthanasia.

**Based on this evidence we urge the Review to be honest and transparent in its report - either explaining exactly how the Bill could be amended to guarantee that there will not be a single wrongful or inhumane death in Tasmania or openly admitting that it cannot be amended to guarantee this and that there will inevitably and unavoidably be wrongful and inhumane deaths if the Bill becomes law.**

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.australiancarealliance.org.au/flawed\\_experiments](https://www.australiancarealliance.org.au/flawed_experiments)

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.australiancarealliance.org.au/wrongful\\_categories](https://www.australiancarealliance.org.au/wrongful_categories)

## Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	3
Creating exemptions from the law on murder and on instigating or aiding suicide .....	3
THE PROPER TEST FOR SAFELY PROVIDING NEW EXCEPTIONS TO THE LAW ON MURDER AND AIDING SUICIDE.....	4
WRONGFUL DEATHS: TWELVE CATEGORIES .....	5
TWELVE CATEGORIES OF WRONGFUL DEATH .....	6
A wrong diagnosis .....	7
A wrong prognosis .....	9
Unaware of or unable to access effective treatment .....	11
No access to palliative care.....	12
Denied funding for medical treatment .....	14
Mentally ill at risk of wrongful death.....	15
Better off dead than disabled .....	19
Can we rule out coercion if we legalise assisted suicide?.....	22
Social contagion of suicide.....	26
Killed without request or while resisting .....	28
Lacking decision-making capacity .....	30
INHUMANE DEATHS BY ASSISTED SUICIDE AND EUTHANASIA .....	31
QUEENSLAND COURT OF APPEAL DECISION ON AIDING SUICIDE: A RED FLAG TO CREATING AN EXEMPTION TO SECTION 163 OF THE TASMANIAN CRIMINAL CODE .....	34
CONCLUSION.....	35

## INTRODUCTION

The [Australian Care Alliance](#) was initially formed in March 2018 by health professionals, lawyers and community activists who had worked together informally to oppose the passage of the *Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2017* through the Parliament of Victoria. It now works nationally throughout Australia.

This submission will use **euthanasia** and **assisted suicide** to refer to the acts proposed to be legalised under the term “*voluntary assisted dying*”, which is vague, novel and euphemistic. (In this context we are using euthanasia, if not otherwise qualified, to refer to active euthanasia which is at least “voluntary” in form if not in substance).

Using the terms euthanasia and assisted suicide makes it clearer that to legalise these acts, albeit subject to eligibility criteria and procedural requirements, will necessitate changing the criminal law on instigating and aiding suicide and on murder, as they are both acts that are intended to cause the death of a person.

### Creating exemptions from the law on murder and on instigating or aiding suicide

The Tasmanian Criminal Code relevantly provides in:

- s 153 (1)-(2) that “*Homicide is the killing of a human being by another. Killing is causing the death of a person by an act ... but for which he would not have died when he did, and which is directly and immediately connected with his death.*”,
- “156 (2) that “*Homicide is culpable when it is caused – (a) by an act intended to cause death*”,
- s157 that “*Culpable homicide is murder if it is committed – (a) with an intention to cause the death of any person*”, and
- s163 that “*Any person who instigates or aids another to kill himself is guilty of a crime*”.

The entire purpose of the Bill is to establish an exemption from the Criminal Code for acts that would otherwise constitute the offence of murder or the offence of instigating or aiding suicide.

The key section of the Bill is s115 (1):

*The Commission is to determine to be VAD substances one or more substances, each of which, when the substance is administered to, or self-administered by, a person in accordance with the instructions of an AHP, is expected to cause the death of the person.*

The administration to a person of a substance “*expected to cause the death of the person*” and with the intention that the administration of that substance will so cause the death of the person, would in every case under current Tasmanian criminal law be a case of murder.

If the *End-of-Life Choices (Voluntary Assisted Dying) Bill 2020* becomes law, there will be **an exception to the law on murder** for a person who administers a specified lethal substance and **an exception to the the law on instigating or aiding suicide** for any person who plays **any role in instigating or aiding** a person to request, obtain or self-administer a specified lethal substance, subject only to a good faith belief that the administration or self-administration is in accordance with the Act. (Bill, s 134)

Obviously, any proposal to create exceptions to the laws prohibiting murder and instigating and aiding suicide should be subject to the most careful scrutiny.

## THE PROPER TEST FOR SAFELY PROVIDING NEW EXCEPTIONS TO THE LAW ON MURDER AND AIDING SUICIDE

What should the test be for establishing that a change to the law on murder and on counselling and aiding murder can be done safely?

Some proponents of legalising assisted suicide or euthanasia admit that it is the case that wrongful deaths will occur.

Andrew Denton, Go Gentle Fonder and Director told [The Project](#)<sup>3</sup>:

*There is no guarantee ever that doctors are going to be 100% right.*

Henry Marsh, a noted British neurosurgeon and champion of assisted suicide, [famously said](#),

*"Even if a few grannies are bullied into committing suicide, isn't that a price worth paying so that all these other people can die with dignity?"*<sup>4</sup>

This is precisely the question that the Review needs to ask.

The proper tests for a law permitting assisted suicide or euthanasia are the ones that are usually applied to any proposal to reintroduce capital punishment:

*"Can we craft a law that will ensure there will not be even one wrongful death?"*

*"Can we ensure that any deaths under this law are humane - that is both rapid and peaceful?"*

In considering a legal regime in which capital punishment is permitted, it would never be thought that **simple compliance with the external forms is sufficient** to answer the question as to whether deaths may be wrongfully brought about or painfully executed.

It is not enough to assert that the police charged a person under a valid law and using the proper processes; that a properly selected and instructed jury returned a verdict of guilty; that a judge properly considered sentencing principles; and that the death is executed according to the approved protocol. Tick, tick, tick all the boxes.

The real argument is over whether external compliance with these processes is sufficient to **guarantee** that no innocent person, or no person for whom mitigating circumstances such as

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://youtu.be/VvsN47Uqbt0>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/879187> [Free registration required to view article]

intellectual disability or mental illness ought to have precluded a death sentence is sentenced to death and that the execution of the death sentence is in **reality** painless and rapid.

Too often is it assumed that simply because two doctors have ticked a box that a person has a terminal illness, will die within six months, has decision making capacity, is not being coerced and so forth that this equates to reality. There is an entirely unwarranted assumption of infallibility that we are not willing to concede to the police, to juries or to learned judges.

Similarly fare less scrutiny has been given to the actual effect of the lethal substances used for euthanasia and assisted suicide than to (often the same) lethal substances used for capital punishment.

It is the considered position of the Australian Care Alliance, based on a review of all the available evidence, that none of the jurisdictions that have legalised euthanasia and/or assisted suicide have succeeded in establishing a genuinely safe framework for assisted suicide and euthanasia.

### **WRONGFUL DEATHS: TWELVE CATEGORIES**

This submission identifies twelve categories of wrongful deaths that have or can occur under any scheme so far in place or proposed which legalises assisted suicide and/or euthanasia.

These categories of wrongful death are:

1. a wrong diagnosis
2. a wrong prognosis
3. unaware of or unable to access effective treatment
4. no access to palliative care
5. denied funding for medical treatment
6. mentally ill at risk
7. “better off dead” than disabled
8. bullying or coercion
9. social contagion of suicide
10. killed without request or while resisting
11. lack of decision-making capacity
12. inhumane deaths by assisted suicide or euthanasia that are neither rapid nor peaceful

The challenge for the Review then is to transparently examine the evidence and to attempt to propose *de novo* a scheme that, unlike any other scheme yet enacted or proposed, ensures

that in assessing candidates to be prescribed or administered lethal substances and in the administration of those lethal substances:

- 1) Doctors never make errors in diagnosis
- 2) Doctors never underestimate a prognosis
- 3) Doctors are aware of all available effective treatments and that all persons in Tasmania, including in remote and indigenous communities, have equitable access to those treatments
- 4) World's best practice palliative care is available to every Tasmanian, including in remote and indigenous communities
- 5) No Tasmanian considers assisted suicide or euthanasia because of financial concerns about the cost of treatment or care, including the full range of palliative care
- 6) Doctors never miss diagnosing clinical depression or demoralisation in persons with a terminal or chronic illness
- 7) Doctors never project a discriminatory attitude towards persons with disabilities being more readily inclined to the view that a person with disabilities would be acting rationally in choosing to end their life
- 8) Doctors never fail to identify elder abuse, coercion or undue influence by family members or others including any influence on a person's decision to request assisted suicide or euthanasia based on subtle societal expectations
- 9) There will be no suicide contagion
- 10) No doctors will become used to ending the lives of their patients and, regardless of the letter of the law, take actions to intentionally end the lives of other patients who do not make an explicit request
- 11) Every death from the self-administration or doctor-administration of a lethal substance under the scheme will be guaranteed to be both rapid and peaceful and that there will be no complications such as seizures, regurgitation, lengthy periods between ingestion/administration and loss of consciousness or between ingestion/administration and death
- 12) Doctors never fail to accurately assess the decision-making capacity of a person requesting euthanasia or assisted suicide.

Alternatively, the Review could acknowledge that these guarantees are not achievable and that introducing a scheme to meet some Tasmanians demand for societal approval and assistance in ending their lives (or having their lives ended) at a time of their own choice necessarily means that other Tasmanians will die wrongfully and/or inhumanely.

## **TWELVE CATEGORIES OF WRONGFUL DEATH**

The Australian Care Alliance has identified twelve categories of wrongful death that could result from any scheme legalising assisted suicide and/or euthanasia.

The challenge for the Review is to demonstrate how such wrongful deaths can be guaranteed not to occur if the *End-of-Life Choices (Voluntary Assisted Dying) Bill 2020* were to become law, with or without amendment.

## A wrong diagnosis

If a person dies by assisted suicide or euthanasia following a **mistaken diagnosis that the person has a terminal or chronic illness** then that is a wrongful death – with no remedy.

The only way to ensure that there are no such wrongful deaths would be to ensure that physicians never make mistakes in diagnoses. Unfortunately this is not achievable.

According to evidence given by Dr Stephen Child, Chair of the New Zealand Medical Association to the New Zealand parliamentary inquiry into the practice of euthanasia:

*“On diagnosis, 10 to 15 per cent of autopsies show that the diagnosis was incorrect. Three per cent of diagnoses of cancer are incorrect”.*

Dr Child said this scope for error was too large, when weighed against the outcome. *“This is an irreversible decision in which the consequences are final.”*<sup>5</sup>

Ten per cent of cases in Australia are misdiagnosed according to Peter McClennan, chief executive at Best Doctors.<sup>6</sup>

A September 2020 article reported that *“In Australia, an estimated 140 000 cases of diagnostic error occur each year”* and that *“overconfidence in incorrect diagnoses’ was a key factor”*. Furthermore, *“Between 11% and 40% of listed diagnoses in older patients with Parkinson disease, dementia, heart failure and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease do not satisfy accepted diagnostic criteria”*.<sup>7</sup>

Two examples illustrate this category of wrongful death:

An August 2018 report on Missouri resident Pasquale Michael Fatino, aged 52, who is suing three doctors at his former primary care clinic for a misdiagnosis of terminal cancer that caused him and his family unnecessary pain and suffering last year, illustrates that such

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/politics/84252580/euthanasia-toofinal-when-the-risk-of-error-is-to-great--doctors>

<sup>6</sup> <https://amp.afr.com/business/insurance/insurance-companies/mlc-life-to-expand-best-doctors-service-20170827-gy4zfk>

<sup>7</sup> Ian Scott and Carmel Crock, “Diagnostic error: incidence, impacts, causes and preventive strategies”, *Medical Journal of Australia*, 2020; 213 (7): 302-305.e2, Published online: 21 September 2020, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.5694/mja2.50771>

mistakes do happen.<sup>8</sup> If assisted suicide or euthanasia had been legal in Missouri, Mr Fatino may have been dead before the misdiagnosis came to light.

This happened to retired Italian magistrate Pietro D'Amico, aged 62, whose family insisted on an autopsy which [found that he did not have a terminal illness at all](#), despite being given such a diagnosis by both Italian and Swiss doctors prior to undergoing assisted suicide in Switzerland.<sup>9</sup>

Simply having two doctors diagnose that a person has a terminal illness is an illusory safeguard. This is made worse when there is no requirement for both doctors to be specialists in the relevant field, although while such a requirement may lessen the rate of misdiagnosis it cannot eliminate it altogether.

The Bill provides that a person is eligible for having their life ended by euthanasia or assisted suicide if, among other criteria, the person *"is suffering intolerably in relation to a relevant medical condition"* (s 10 (1) (e)). To be so suffering it is a requirement that the person *"has a relevant medical condition"*. (s 14 (a)).

The determination (s. 27, 33, 47 and 55) that a person *"has relevant medical condition"* is to be made by two medical practitioners each of whom must have *"relevant experience in treating or managing the medical condition expected to cause the death of the person"* (s 9 (c)).

*"Relevant experience"* is not further defined and could mean merely that the medical practitioner has, perhaps as a GP, had at least one patient with the specific medical condition.

Neither is required to hold a fellowship with a specialist medical college relevant to the specific medical condition.

Either medical practitioner could seek further information, including, say, a referral to an actual specialist, to enable them to determine whether the person has a relevant medical condition. However, they are not required to do so.

There is, in short, no reason not to anticipate the same level at least of wrong diagnoses among persons requesting euthanasia and assisted suicide as the evidence cited above suggests occurs more broadly in Australia and similar countries. There therefore will be wrongful deaths under the Bill from misdiagnosis.

There is no remedy for a wrongful death by euthanasia or assisted suicide based on misdiagnosis. How many wrongful deaths from euthanasia or assisted suicide following misdiagnosis of a terminal illness are too many?

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.kansascity.com/news/business/health-care/article216764080.html>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.thelocal.ch/20130711/assisted-suicide-in-question-after-botched-diagnosis>

## A wrong prognosis

If a person dies by assisted suicide or euthanasia **after being told in error that they have less than six months to live when they may have many years of life ahead of them** then that is a wrongful death – with no remedy.

This applies regardless of whether the legislation permitting assisted suicide or euthanasia sets a minimum time to expected death (six months in Victoria, Oregon and other US jurisdictions) or not (Belgium, the Netherlands, Canada).

A survey of the medical literature on prognosis indicates that **an accurate prognosis is notoriously difficult to make.**

[A study on the accuracy of prognoses in oncology](#) found that “*discrimination between patients who would survive for one year and those who would not was very poor*”.<sup>10</sup>

Another [paper](#) describes doctors’ ability at predicting survival at 1 year as “*only slightly better than a random guess*”.<sup>11</sup>

[A study published in 2000 in the British Medical Journal](#) found that physicians only made accurate (within 33% margin either way) prognoses in 20% of cases for terminally ill patients.

Significantly for the use of a prognosis in allowing access to assisted suicide or euthanasia is the finding that in 17% of cases physicians were overly pessimistic in their prognosis by more than 33% and out by a factor of 2 in 11.3% of cases.<sup>12</sup>

In other words, perhaps **more than one in ten people given a prognosis of 12 months to live may live for 2 years or more.**

Evidence from the states of Oregon and Washington, where assisted suicide is legal, **demonstrates conclusively** that physicians make significant errors in determining a prognosis of less than six months to live in the context of a request to access assisted suicide.

Although the law in Washington State specifies that only persons who have a disease that will “produce death within six months” may request lethal doses of medication from a physician, the data shows that in each year between 5% and 17% of those who die after requesting a lethal dose do so more than 25 weeks later with one person in 2012 dying nearly 3 years (150

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0895435696003162>

<sup>11</sup> <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0161407>

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.bmj.com/content/bmj/320/7233/469.full.pdf>

weeks) later, one person in 2015 dying nearly two years later (95 weeks) and one person in 2016 dying more than two years (112 weeks) later.<sup>13</sup>

In Oregon in 2018 one person ingested lethal medication 807 days (2 years 2 ½ months) after the initial request for the lethal prescription was made. The longest duration between initial request and ingestion recorded is 1009 days (that is 2 years and 9 months).<sup>14</sup> Evidently in these cases the prognosis was wildly inaccurate.

Dr Kenneth Stevens has written about his experience of how the prognosis of six months to live works in practice under Oregon's law:

*Oregon's assisted-suicide law applies to patients predicted to have less than six months to live. In 2000, I had a cancer patient named Jeanette Hall. Another doctor had given her a terminal diagnosis of six months to a year to live. This was based on her not being treated for cancer.*

*At our first meeting, Jeanette told me that she did not want to be treated, and that she wanted to opt for what our law allowed – to kill herself with a lethal dose of barbiturates.*

*I did not and do not believe in assisted suicide. I informed her that her cancer was treatable and that her prospects were good. But she wanted "the pills." She had made up her mind, but she continued to see me.*

*On the third or fourth visit, I asked her about her family and learned that she had a son. I asked her how he would feel if she went through with her plan. Shortly after that, she agreed to be treated, and her cancer was cured.*

*Five years later she saw me in a restaurant and said, "Dr. Stevens, you saved my life!"*

*For her, the mere presence of legal assisted suicide had steered her to suicide.<sup>15</sup>*

---

<sup>13</sup> Washington State Department of Health, *Death with Dignity Act Reports, 2009-2017* available at: <http://www.doh.wa.gov/YouandYourFamily/IllnessandDisease/DeathwithDignityAct/DeathwithDignityData>

<sup>14</sup> Oregon Public Health Division, *Oregon Death With Dignity Act: 2018 Data Summary, Table 1*, p.13 <https://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/PROVIDERPARTNERRESOURCES/EVALUATIONRESEARCH/DEATHWITHDIGNITYACT/Documents/year21.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> Kenneth Stevens "Doctor helped patient with cancer choose life over assisted suicide", *Missoulian*, 27 November 2012, [http://missoulian.com/news/opinion/mailbag/doctor-helped-patient-with-cancer-choose-life-over-assisted-suicide/article\\_63e092dc-37e5-11e2-ae61-001a4bcf887a.html](http://missoulian.com/news/opinion/mailbag/doctor-helped-patient-with-cancer-choose-life-over-assisted-suicide/article_63e092dc-37e5-11e2-ae61-001a4bcf887a.html)

Jeanette Stevens is still alive today and has enjoyed 20 years of life that would have been taken from her if she had not been talked out of pursuing assisted suicide under Oregon's fatally flawed law.

As set out above in relation to misdiagnosis, the Bill would allow two medical practitioners, neither of who holds a fellowship in a specialist college for the relevant medical condition, to determine that the person meets the eligibility criteria in relation to prognosis.

The wording of the criteria is broad: "*is expected to cause the death of the person within 6 months*". The usual meaning of "expected" is "regarded as likely" or "anticipated".

Clearly under the provisions of the Bill people who may in fact have had years to live will have their lives ended prematurely by euthanasia or assisted suicide.

How many wrongful deaths from errors in prognosis would be too many?

### **Unaware of or unable to access effective treatment**

Some assisted suicide or euthanasia laws purport to provide an additional safeguard by requiring at least one doctor with relevant specialist experience to assess the person and inform them of all relevant information about the person's condition.

However, despite such provisions the evidence from jurisdictions which have legalised assisted suicide or euthanasia shows that **some people miss out on treatment that could have helped them and instead suffer a wrongful death** by assisted suicide or euthanasia.

Out of the four deaths under the Northern Territory's short lived euthanasia laws one of those who died by euthanasia would have benefited from radiotherapy or strontium but neither of these was available in the Northern Territory. Another could have been helped by stenting for obstructive jaundice or the management of bowel obstruction. However, Dr Nitschke who euthanased this person, admitted to having "*limited experience, not having been involved in the care for the dying before becoming involved with the*" euthanasia law.<sup>16</sup>

Similar examples are found in other jurisdiction such as in case 15 reported in [the 2011 annual report](#) of the Netherlands Regional Euthanasia Review Committees which conclude that the attending physician failed to achieve an accurate diagnosis of the woman's back pain and only prescribed limited pain relief medication. Consequently it could not be said that the woman's pain was definitively unrelievable. Of course the woman can get no relief from this finding of

---

<sup>16</sup>

[http://www.healthprofessionalsayno.info/uploads/1/0/9/2/109258189/seven\\_deaths\\_in\\_darwin\\_case\\_studies\\_unde.pdf](http://www.healthprofessionalsayno.info/uploads/1/0/9/2/109258189/seven_deaths_in_darwin_case_studies_unde.pdf)

error on the part of the doctor who failed her and then euthanased her as she is already dead by euthanasia.<sup>17</sup>

The Bill, in s24 (2) (ii), requires a medical practitioner before determining a first request to give to the person, along with other information, information about *“treatment of the relevant medical condition that has been, or may be, administered to the person”*. This medical practitioner does not need to be a specialist in the condition for this information on treatments is being provided, although there is a requirement to have *“relevant experience in treating or managing the medical condition expected to cause the death of the person”* (s 9 (c)).

No legal framework permitting assisted suicide or euthanasia has yet been established which effectively ensures that all persons being killed or helped to commit suicide are properly informed about all treatment options available for their condition.

If the Bill becomes law, with or without amendment, some people will inevitably be killed by euthanasia or aided to commit suicide who could have benefited from treatment.

### No access to palliative care

In [Oregon in 2018](#) in 17.9% of cases (nearly one in six) the attending physician reports that he or she did not know whether or not the person who died after ingesting the lethal medication which the physician prescribed had had any concern about inadequate pain control at the end of life.

[ORS 127.815](#) sets out as one of the responsibilities of an attending physician under the Death With Dignity Act a duty *“To ensure that the patient is making an informed decision, inform the patient of the feasible alternatives, including, but not limited to, comfort care, hospice care and pain control”*.

Before lethal medication is prescribed a person must sign a request form affirming, among other things, *“I have been fully informed of my diagnosis, prognosis, the nature of medication to be prescribed and potential associated risks, the expected result, and the feasible alternatives, including comfort care, hospice care and pain control.”*

But if the attending physician has not asked the person about any concerns about inadequate pain control at the end of life how can the attending physician possibly have properly informed the person about feasible alternatives to ingesting lethal medication such as “comfort care, hospice care and pain control”?

In a further 25.6% of cases from 2018 the attending physician reported that concern about inadequate pain control at the end of life was factor in a person’s request. [Earlier annual](#)

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://english.euthanasiecommissie.nl/binaries/euthanasiecommissie-en/documents/publications/annual-reports/2002/annual-reports/annual-reports/rte.jv2011.engels.def-36.pdf> - p. 17-19

[reports noted that “Patients discussing concern about inadequate pain control with their physicians were not necessarily experiencing pain.”<sup>18</sup>](#)

Palliative Care Victoria has [stated](#):

*Achieving the effective management of pain and other symptoms is a high priority in the care of people with a life limiting illness and people who are dying. Where these symptoms are not readily alleviated by general health and care services, a referral to access the specialised expertise of palliative care services should be made. In most cases, specialist palliative care teams are able to address the person’s physical pain and other symptoms and to respond to their psycho-social, emotional, spiritual and cultural needs so that they are able to live and die well with dignity. However, a small minority of patients experience refractory symptoms such as agitated delirium, difficulties breathing, pain and convulsions.*

In these rare cases palliative sedation therapy is available to provide adequate relief of suffering.

*[T]he level of sedation used should be the lowest necessary to provide adequate relief of suffering: “The doses of medications should be increased or reduced gradually to a level at which suffering is palliated with a minimum suppression of the consciousness levels and undesirable effects, with documentation of the reason for changes and response to such manoeuvres.” Only under exceptional circumstances is deep and continuous sedation required from initiation of palliative sedation therapy.<sup>19</sup>*

No case for legalising assisted suicide can properly be made on the basis that this is the only possible response to people facing unrelievable pain. Every Tasmanian deserves access to gold standard palliative care which can alleviate pain, including using palliative sedation as a last resort.

Neither medical practitioner assessing a person’s eligibility for euthanasia or assisted suicide is required to have any knowledge or experience with palliative care, let alone be a specialist in palliative care. Under s 24 (2) (e), before determining a first request, a medical practitioner must give the person “any information as to palliative care that may reasonably be able to be provided to the person.” This is hardly a guarantee that the person will be given up to date, accurate and comprehensive information in a manner that will maximise their opportunity to understand the full benefit to them of modern, gold standard palliative care.

---

18

<http://public.health.oregon.gov/ProviderPartnerResources/EvaluationResearch/DeathwithDignityAct/Documents/year6.pdf>

19

[http://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/images/stories/committees/lsc/Submissions/Submission\\_236\\_-\\_Palliative\\_Care\\_Victoria.pdf](http://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/images/stories/committees/lsc/Submissions/Submission_236_-_Palliative_Care_Victoria.pdf)

Consequently, some people will die under the provisions of the Bill who, if they had had access to modern, gold standard palliative care would have benefited significantly.

Wrongful deaths by assisted suicide or euthanasia occur when people are not fully informed about palliative care by actual palliative care specialists and request assisted suicide or euthanasia due to misplaced fears about pain or other physical symptoms.

## Denied funding for medical treatment

People who are denied funding for medical treatment by medical insurers or the public health system but are offered funding for assisted suicide or euthanasia, as has happened in Oregon, California and Canada are at risk of wrongful deaths either by being denied needed treatment or bullied into agreeing to assisted suicide.

In Oregon in two notorious cases, those of [Barbara Wagner](#)<sup>20</sup> and [Randy Stroup](#),<sup>21</sup> the Oregon Health Plan informed a patient by letter that the particular cancer treatment recommended by their physicians was not covered by the Plan but that the cost of a lethal prescription to end their life would be covered.

In California [Stephanie Packer](#), a wife and mother of four who was diagnosed with a terminal form of scleroderma, reports that “when the [assisted suicide] law was passed, it was a week later I received a letter in the mail saying they [her insurance company] were going to deny coverage for the chemotherapy that we were asking for.” She called her insurance company to find out why her coverage had been denied. On the call, she also asked whether suicide pills were covered under her plan. She was told “Yes, we do provide that to our patients, and you would only have to pay \$1.20 for the [lethal] medication.”

In Canada [Roger Foley](#), who has a crippling brain disease, has been seeking support to live at home. He is currently in an Ontario hospital that is threatening to start charging him \$1,800 a day. The hospital has told Roger that his other option is euthanasia or assisted suicide under Canada’s medical assistance in dying law.<sup>22</sup>

Additionally concerns about the financial cost of treatment or care may be an open or hidden motivator for requesting assisted suicide or euthanasia.

Of those who died from ingesting a lethal dose of medication in Oregon in [2018](#), more than one in twenty (5.35%) mentioned the “*financial implications of treatment*” as a consideration. While this percentage is relatively small it is appalling that since 1998 fifty seven (57)

---

<sup>20</sup> <https://abcnews.go.com/Health/story?id=5517492>

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.foxnews.com/story/2008/07/28/oregon-offers-terminal-patients-doctor-assisted-suicide-instead-medical-care.html>

<sup>22</sup> [https://www.australiancarealliance.org.au/canada\\_assisted\\_suicide\\_not\\_assisted\\_living](https://www.australiancarealliance.org.au/canada_assisted_suicide_not_assisted_living)

Oregonians have died from a lethal prescription after expressing concerns about the financial implications of treatment.<sup>23</sup>

In more than one out of four cases (26.8%) in [2018](#) the attending physician simply did not bother to find out whether or not a concern about the cost of treatment or care was underlying the request for lethal medication.

How can an attending physician form a valid view that a request for lethal medication is being made “voluntarily” if a possible concern about the financial costs of treatment or care is never explored with the person?

Not every Tasmanian, especially those in more remote areas or indigenous communities, has equal access to affordable medical care.

No system permitting euthanasia or assisted suicide can guarantee that no person will have their lives ended wrongfully by these means because affordable, life-saving treatment was not offered to them.

### **Mentally ill at risk of wrongful death**

People with a mental illness are at risk of wrongful death under any law authorising assisted suicide or euthanasia.

In the Netherlands and Belgium mental illness is seen as a condition for which euthanasia or assisted suicide is increasingly considered to be an appropriate response.

In Belgium there were 201 cases of euthanasia for psychiatric disorders between 2014 and 2017. This included 25 cases of people under 40 being killed by euthanasia. In relation to these troubled young people the Commission [observes](#):

*In the group of patients under 40, it is mainly personality and behavioral disorders. All these patients have been treated for many years, both outpatient and residential. There has always been talk of intractable suffering. For this type of disorder, serious psychological trauma at a very young age has been mentioned several times, such as domestic violence, psychological neglect or sexual abuse.<sup>24</sup>*

***Belgium is treating the victims of child abuse by domestic violence, neglect and sexual abuse by killing them!!***

---

<sup>23</sup> Oregon Public Health Division, *Oregon Death With Dignity Act: 2018 Data Summary, Table 1*, p.12 <https://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/PROVIDERPARTNERRESOURCES/EVALUATIONRESEARCH/DEATHWITHDIGNITYACT/Documents/year21.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> Commission fédérale de Contrôle et d'Évaluation de l'Euthanasie, [https://organesdeconcertation.sante.belgique.be/sites/default/files/documents/8\\_rapport-euthanasie\\_2016-2017-fr.pdf](https://organesdeconcertation.sante.belgique.be/sites/default/files/documents/8_rapport-euthanasie_2016-2017-fr.pdf)

In Oregon and Washington State where the laws provide for *optional referral* for psychiatric assessment the evidence shows that the gatekeeping medical practitioners very seldom refer and that this results in persons with *treatable clinical depression* being wrongfully assisted to commit suicide.

Research by Linda Ganzini has established that one in six people who died under Oregon's law had clinical depression.<sup>25</sup>

Depression is supposed to be screened for under the Act. However, in 2018 only 3 out of 168 people (1.78%) who died under the Oregon law were referred by the prescribing doctor for a psychiatric evaluation before writing a script for a lethal substance.<sup>26</sup>

***This means it is likely that in Oregon in 2018 alone about 25 people with clinical depression were prescribed and took a lethal poison without being referred for a psychiatric evaluation.***

In the Northern Territory, where euthanasia was legal from July 1996-March 1997, and compulsory screening by a psychiatrist was required, there was a failure to adequately identify depression, demoralization or other psychiatric issues which may have been treatable in all four cases of persons killed under that regime.

During the nine-month period in which the ROTI Act was in effect and under its provisions, four people were assisted to terminate their lives by Dr Philip Nitschke.

[Case studies on these four deaths have been published.](#)<sup>27</sup> The principal author of this paper is Professor David Kissane, who is a consultant psychiatrist and professor of palliative medicine. Philip Nitschke is a co-author of the paper.

The case studies examine how the conditions required by the ROTI Act were met. Cases numbered 3, 4, 5 and 6 in this paper refer to those cases which ended with the person's life being terminated with the assistance of Dr Philip Nitschke.

From the case histories, it is apparent that cases 3 and 4 each had depressive symptoms.

In case 3, the patient had received "*counselling and anti-depressant medication for several years*". He spoke of feeling sometimes so suicidal that "*if he had a gun he would have used*

---

<sup>25</sup> Linda Ganzini et al., "Prevalence of depression and anxiety in patients requesting physicians' aid in dying: cross sectional survey", *BMJ* 2008;337:a1682, <http://www.bmj.com/content/bmj/337/bmj.a1682.full.pdf>

<sup>26</sup> Oregon Public Health Division, *Oregon Death With Dignity Act: 2018 Data Summary, Table 1*, p.11 <https://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/PROVIDERPARTNERRESOURCES/EVALUATIONRESEARCH/DEATHWITHDIGNITYACT/Documents/year21.pdf>

<sup>27</sup> [https://d3n8a8pro7vnmx.cloudfront.net/australiancarealliance/pages/95/attachments/original/1553489155/seven\\_deaths\\_in\\_darwin\\_case\\_studies\\_unde.pdf?1553489155](https://d3n8a8pro7vnmx.cloudfront.net/australiancarealliance/pages/95/attachments/original/1553489155/seven_deaths_in_darwin_case_studies_unde.pdf?1553489155)

it". He had outbursts in which he would "yell and scream, as intolerant as hell" and he "wept frequently".

Neither the patient's adult sons nor the members of the community palliative care team who were caring for him were told he was being assessed for euthanasia. "A psychiatrist from another state certified that no treatable clinical depression was present."

In case 4, "the psychiatrist noted that the patient showed reduced reactivity to her surroundings, lowered mood, hopelessness, resignation about her future, and a desire to die. He judged her depression consistent with her medical condition, adding that side-effects of her antidepressant medication, dozepin, may limit further increase in dose."

Kissane comments that "case 4 was receiving treatment for depression, but no consideration was given to the efficacy of dose, change of medication, or psychotherapeutic management." While Dr Nitschke "judged this patient as unlikely to respond to further treatment", Kissane, comments that "nonetheless, continued psychiatric care seemed warranted – a psychiatrist can have an active therapeutic role in ameliorating suffering rather than being used only as a gatekeeper to euthanasia".

In case 6 a key factor seemed to be the patient's distress at "having witnessed" the death of her sister who also had breast cancer, "particularly the indignity of double incontinence". She "feared she would die in a similar manner". She "was also concerned about being a burden to her children, although her daughters were trained nurses".

Kissane noted that "fatigue, frailty, depression and other symptoms" – not pain – were the prominent concerns of those who received euthanasia. He observed that "palliative care facilities were underdeveloped in the Northern Territory, and patients in our study needed palliative care... There is a need to respond creatively to social isolation, and to treat actively all symptoms with early and skilled palliative care."

Further concerns are raised by the report on case 5. Dr Nitschke reported that "on this occasion the psychiatrist phoned within 20 min, saying that this case was straightforward". This assessment took place on the day on which euthanasia was planned. This case involved an elderly, unmarried man who had migrated from England and had no relatives in Australia. Dr Nitschke recalled "his sadness over the man's loneliness and isolation as he administered euthanasia". [Dr Nitschke has since revealed in testimony to a Senate committee](https://www.aph.gov.au/~media/wopapub/senate/senate/commttee/S10740_pdf.ashx), that he personally paid for this psychiatric consultation and that it in fact took less than 20 minutes.<sup>28</sup>

There is no model from any jurisdiction that has legalised assisted suicide and/or euthanasia for adequately ensuring that no person who is assisted to commit suicide or killed directly by euthanasia is suffering from treatable clinical depression or other forms of mental illness that may affect the capacity to form a competent, settled, determination to die by assisted suicide or euthanasia.

---

<sup>28</sup> [https://www.aph.gov.au/~media/wopapub/senate/senate/commttee/S10740\\_pdf.ashx](https://www.aph.gov.au/~media/wopapub/senate/senate/commttee/S10740_pdf.ashx)

The Bill provides, in s10 (2) that *“For the purposes of this Act, a person is not eligible to access voluntary assisted dying by reason only that the person – (a) has a mental illness, within the meaning of the Mental Health Act 2013.”*

This does not protect persons with mental illness, including with undiagnosed depression and demoralisation associated with the diagnosis of a terminal illness, from having their lives ended by euthanasia or assisted suicide when treatment of their depression or demoralisation would have been of benefit to them.

Nor does this wording definitively exclude all mental illness *per se* from the definition of a “relevant medical condition” in s6 of the Bill. For example, a person with a mental illness considered by a medical practitioner as likely to result in death within six months due to treatment resistant suicidal ideation could be assessed as eligible for euthanasia or assisted suicide. In this case the person would not be eligible “by reason only that the person has a mental illness”, but by reason that the person was determined to have a mental illness likely to cause death within six months and not curable by any treatment acceptable to the person.

Section 14 (4) of the Bill does provide for entirely optional referral of a person by the person’s authorised medical practitioner, consulting medical practitioner or administering health practitioner to *“a medical practitioner, psychiatrist, or psychologist, who has the skills and training that are appropriate to make such a determination”* being a determination as to whether the person has the required decision-making capacity for a decision under the Act.

The definition of “decision-making capacity” in s12 of the Bill is entirely based on cognitive understanding and does not require any assessment of factors such as impairment of judgement due to depression and other mental health issues.

There is nothing in the Bill to preclude a medical practitioner who believes that a person is deeply affected by depression or by a mental illness such as bipolar disorder nonetheless determining, without a referral, that the person has the required decision-making capacity.

Oregon’s Death With Dignity Act provides (Oregon Revised Statute 127.825) that *“If in the opinion of the attending physician or the consulting physician a patient may be suffering from a psychiatric or psychological disorder or depression causing impaired judgment, either physician shall refer the patient for counseling.”*

Jurisdictions, like Oregon, that provide for optional referral for psychiatric assessment manifestly fail to identify all cases of clinical depression.

The only jurisdiction which has required a psychiatric assessment for each case of euthanasia was the Northern Territory. However, this system signally failed to adequately identify depression, demoralization or other psychiatric issues which may have been treatable in all four cases of persons killed by former doctor Philip Nitschke under the Rights of the Terminally Ill Act 1995 (NT).

Compulsory referral to a psychiatrist, who may have never seen the person before, for a single brief assessment of whether the person’s decision making capacity about assisted suicide or euthanasia is affected by depression or other psychiatric factors is clearly an inadequate safeguard and will not make assisted suicide “safe”.

Regardless of any possible amendments, if the Bill is enacted then some people who die wrongful deaths by assisted suicide or euthanasia who could have benefited significantly from diagnosis and expert treatment of depression, demoralisation or other mental health issues.

Additionally, the power of the Commission under section 6 (4) of the Bill to grant exemptions unilaterally and arbitrarily to the six- or twelve-month period when death is “expected” would allow virtually limitless expansion of the eligibility criteria to cover cases of chronic mental illness not even expected to cause death. This provision poses a serious risk for persons living with mental illness, who are not otherwise dying, to have their lives prematurely ended by a request for euthanasia or assisted suicide made during a low point in their lifelong challenge of living with mental illness in the face of societal prejudices and inadequate economic, social and mental health supports, including, under this new medico-legal regime, affirmation by a psychiatrist or other health care provider of a person’s sense of hopelessness and the futility of life.

## Better off dead than disabled

Due to social prejudice and ignorance which is widespread including among physicians and other health professionals, people with disabilities are often considered to be “better off dead”.

This puts them at additional risk of wrongful death under any scheme that legalises euthanasia or assisted suicide.

In the Netherlands and Belgium disability – both physical and intellectual – is accepted as a reason to euthanase a person.

In Oregon the **five main reasons** given for requesting assisted suicide **all relate to disability** issues.

These are [concerns](#) about decreasing ability to participate in activities that made life enjoyable (90.5%), loss of autonomy (91.7%), loss of dignity (66.7%), physical or emotional burden on family, friends, or caregivers (54.2%) and the loss of control of bodily functions, such as incontinence and vomiting (366.9%) .<sup>29</sup> **These are all disability issues.**

Any assisted suicide proposal that includes a subjective notion of suffering as part of the eligibility criteria would allow assisted suicide for a similar set of concerns.

This set of concerns reflects the day to day realities of life for many people living with disabilities of various kinds.

If we legalise assisted suicide for incontinence, a loss of ability to engage in one’s favourite hobby, a need to have other’s take care of your physical needs, a loss of mobility and so forth what is the take home message for those who live with these challenges every day?

---

29

<https://assets.nationbuilder.com/australiancarealliance/pages/96/attachments/original/1552018763/Oregon - Twenty one years of assisted suicide.pdf?1552018763>

The late Stella Young, comedian, writer and disability activist, [wrote on the implications of legalising assisted suicide for people living with disabilities](#):

*People make all sorts of assumptions about the quality of my life and my levels of independence. They're almost always wrong.*

*I've lost count of the number of times I've been told, "I just don't think I could live like you," or "I wouldn't have the courage in your situation," or, **my favourite one to overhear (and I've overheard it more than once), "You'd just bloody top yourself, wouldn't you?"***

*Also, social attitudes towards disabled people come from a medical profession that takes a deficit view of disability. This is my major concern with legalising assisted death; that it will give doctors more control over our lives. As a disabled person who has had a lot to do with the medical profession, I can tell you that this is the space in which I've experienced some of the very worst disability prejudice and discrimination. Doctors might know about our biology, but it doesn't mean they know about our lives.*

*Media reports on assisted dying feed these misconceptions. ABC News reported this week on the case of Barbara Harling, a Queensland woman with motor neurone disease who said that she would consider moving to Tasmania if the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill had passed. Harling is quoted as saying: "Well, let's put it this way. I can use my left hand, my right hand is just about useless. If I can't use my left hand to wipe my bottom, then I can do nothing else for myself. That means someone has to do everything for me. I couldn't bear to live like that."*

*The thing is, a lot of people do live like that. I know many, many people who depend on personal assistants for all of their daily living tasks, some of them requiring 24 hour care. **Having to rely on someone else to wipe your bum may not be something anyone aspires to, but I'm quite sure it's never killed anyone.***<sup>30</sup>

Proposals for assisted suicide offer require assessing doctors to screen for depression or other mental health conditions that may be affecting the person's decision making capacity. Similarly the assessing doctors are supposed to determine that the request is voluntary and not the result of coercion.

Doctors are less likely to identify depression in people with disability, simply by assuming that it is normal for a person with disability to show signs of depression such as sadness and lack of hope.

Doctors may also easily miss the particular vulnerability of a person living with disability to overt or subtle coercion from family or caregivers who reinforce a feeling that the person is a burden, "too much trouble", "life is too hard" and so forth.

---

<sup>30</sup> <http://www.abc.net.au/rampup/articles/2013/10/18/3872088.htm>

[Claire Freeman](#), who is tetraplegic after a car accident at age 17, reports that after four unsuccessful suicide attempts a suicide counsellor actually recommended she try assisted suicide at a facility in Switzerland.

She points out that the psychologist and a psychiatrist who saw her after a suicide attempt, were looking at her and just seeing the disability. "They were not saying, 'Hey, what's going on in your life? Are you working too much? Are you in too much pain?' "None of those questions were asked, it was just, 'Of course she wants to die, she's in a wheelchair, she's in pain.'"

Claire, now aged 40 years, has gone on to do a doctorate on decisions around mobility equipment, to be a model at Milan's Fashion Week. She also contributed to a documentary opposing the proposal to legalise euthanasia in New Zealand.<sup>31</sup>

Legalising assisted suicide and euthanasia poses a direct threat to the lives of some people with disabilities who may be assessed as eligible to request it. Doctors are more likely to agree that they are "*better off dead*" and to miss signs of depression or coercion.

Legalising assisted suicide and euthanasia for being a burden, incontinence and loss of ability to enjoy activities trivialises issues faced daily by persons living with disability and demeans their courage in facing the challenges of life.

Section 10 (2) of the Bill provides that "*For the purposes of this Act, a person is not eligible to access voluntary assisted dying by reason only that the person – (b) has a disability, within the meaning of the Disability Services Act 2011.*"

Section 4 of that act relevantly provides that:

*disability, in relation to a person, means a disability of the person which –*

*(a) is attributable to a cognitive, intellectual, psychiatric, sensory or physical impairment or a combination of those impairments; and*

*(b) is permanent or likely to be permanent; and*

*(c) results in –*

*(i) a substantial restriction in the capacity of the person to carry on a profession, business or occupation, or to participate in social or cultural life; and*

*(ii) the need for continuing significant support services; and*

*(d) may or may not be of a chronic episodic nature;*

There is significant overlap between elements of this definition and the kinds of things that have been given as reasons for requesting assisted suicide in jurisdictions like Oregon and that are likely to count as mental or physical suffering under the provisions of this Bill (Section 14).

---

<sup>31</sup> [https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c\\_id=1&objectid=12211310](https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12211310)

As with mental illness, the wording in s 10 (2) (b) of the Bill would not preclude any disability from being treated as a relevant medical condition if a medical practitioner determined that it is likely to cause death within six months and was not curable by any treatment acceptable to the person.

Additionally, the power of the Commission under section 6 (4) of the Bill to grant exemptions unilaterally and arbitrarily to the six- or twelve-month period when death is “expected” would allow virtually limitless expansion of the eligibility criteria to cover cases of chronic disability not even expected to cause death. This provision poses a serious risk for persons living with disability who are not otherwise dying to have their lives prematurely ended by a request for euthanasia or assisted suicide made during a low point in their lifelong challenge of living with a disability in the face of societal prejudices and inadequate economic, social and health supports.

The Bill, then, if enacted is likely to led to the wrongful deaths of persons with disability due to societal and systemic prejudices that prevent such persons getting all the assistance needed to help them live with a disability and that make it more likely that medical practitioners and others, such as family members, would affirm a person with disability in any expression of a desire to end their life by assisted suicide or have their life ended by euthanasia.

### **Can we rule out coercion if we legalise assisted suicide?**

Assisted suicide and euthanasia laws usually require that a request be voluntary and free of coercion.

Section 13 of the Bill provides that:

*For the purposes of this Act, a person is acting voluntarily if the person is not acting under duress, coercion or because of a threat of punishment or unfavourable treatment, or a promise to give a reward or benefit, to the person or another person.*

However, to be truly voluntary a request would need to be not just free of overt coercion but also **free from undue influence, subtle pressures and familial or societal expectations**.

A regime in which assisted suicide is made legal and in which the decision to ask for assisted suicide is positively affirmed as a wise choice in itself creates a framework in which a person with low self-esteem, or who is more susceptible to the influence of others, may well express a request for assisted suicide that the person would otherwise never have considered.

Elder abuse, including from adult children with “**inheritance impatience**” is a growing problem in Australia. This makes legalising assisting suicide unsafe for the elderly.

Undue influence is increasingly being seen as a relevant factor in the financial abuse of elders.

Seniors Rights Victoria provides [a useful summary of case law and best practice on undue influence](#) in the financial abuse of elders.<sup>32</sup>

It is clear from this summary that undue influence can easily be missed and may be difficult to identify. Of course, the courts can apply the remedy of rescission if it is established. In the

---

<sup>32</sup> <https://assetsforcare.seniorsrights.org.au/relationship-breaks-down/equity/undue-influence-unconscionable-dealing/>

case of assisted suicide a failure to spot undue influence before writing a prescription for a lethal dose will be incapable of remedy once the lethal dose is ingested.

A [parliamentary report on Elder Abuse in New South Wales](#) also referenced the failure of professionals to identify undue influence and so unwittingly facilitate elder abuse.<sup>33</sup>

It cites the Council on the Ageing NSW as observing that the “*NSW Interagency policy on preventing and responding to abuse of older people does not address the more common cases where elder abuse is perpetrated by a family member or carer ‘in an environment of isolation, dependence and undue influence’*”. (para 5.13 on p. 54)

The report also notes that:

*Capacity Australia observed that financial abuse is often fueled by ignorance and family conflict, as well as ‘inheritance impatience’. It further noted that undue influence by one family member over another is commonly facilitated by legal professionals because of their failure to detect when an older person is struggling to manage their financial affairs, that is, when they lack financial capacity.* (para 6.6 on p. 80)

As long ago as 1885 in what is still cited in Australian law as the leading case on undue influence, [Sir James Hannen described some of the kinds of subtle coercion](#) that a frail, elderly or ill person may be subjected to that could be hard for any outside person to detect.

*The coercion may of course be of different kinds, it may be in the grossest form, such as actual confinement or violence, or a person in the last days or hours of life may have become so weak and feeble, that a very little pressure will be sufficient to bring about the desired result, and it may even be that **the mere talking to him at that stage of illness and pressing something upon him may so fatigue the brain, that the sick person may be induced, for quietness’ sake, to do anything.** This would equally be coercion, though not actual violence.*<sup>34</sup>

Evidence from jurisdictions that have legalised assisted suicide or euthanasia shows that coercion, including the feeling of **being a burden on others, is a real problem.**

---

<sup>33</sup>

<https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/committees/DBAssets/InquiryReport/ReportAcrobat/6063/Report%252044%2520-%2520Elder%2520abuse%2520in%2520New%2520South%2520Wales.pdf>

<sup>34</sup> <https://swarb.co.uk/wingrove-v-wingrove-1885/>

The data from Oregon shows that in 2018 more one out of two (54.16%) people who died after taking prescribed lethal medication cited concerns about being a “*Burden on family, friends/caregivers*” as a reason for the request.<sup>35</sup>

In a further 14.9% of cases (nearly one in seven cases) the attending physician reported not knowing if the person who requested lethal medication and subsequently died after ingesting had a concern about physical or emotional burden on family, friends or caregivers.<sup>36</sup>

[ORS 127.815](#) sets out as the very first responsibility of an attending physician under the Death With Dignity Act a duty to “*Make the initial determination of whether a patient has a terminal disease, is capable, and has made the request voluntarily*”

How can a physician come to a firm conclusion that a person is voluntarily requesting lethal medication in order to end their lives without exploring whether or not the person is motivated by a concern about the physical or emotional burden on family, friends or caregivers.

Surely such a discussion is necessary to exclude any possibility that the person is making the request under duress, subject to coercion or undue influence from a family member or caregiver.

Additionally, in the absence of such a discussion there may be a missed opportunity to relieve the person’s concern about being a burden by arranging respite for family caregivers or additional care or support.

If the 14.9% of cases where the attending physician does not even bother exploring this issue with a person before writing a prescription for lethal medication are added to the 54.2% of cases in 2018 where the attending physician reports knowing that the person had a concern about the physical or emotional burden on family, friends or caregivers then in nearly seven out of ten cases (69.1%) concern about being a burden is or maybe a factor in a request for lethal medication.

The data from [Washington](#)<sup>37</sup> shows that in 2017 more than half (56%) of those who died from prescribed lethal drugs cited concerns about being a “*Burden on family, friends/caregivers*” as a reason for the request.

Does the concern about being a burden originate from the person or is it generated by subtle or not so subtle messages from family, friends and caregivers - including physicians - who find the person to be a burden or a nuisance or just taking too long to die?

---

<sup>35</sup> Oregon Public Health Division, *Oregon Death With Dignity Act: 2018 Data Summary, Table 1*, p.12  
<https://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/PROVIDERPARTNERRESOURCES/EVALUATIONRESEARCH/DEATHWITHDIGNITYACT/Documents/year21.pdf>

<sup>36</sup>  
[https://assets.nationbuilder.com/australiancarealliance/pages/96/attachments/original/1552018763/Oregon\\_-\\_Twenty\\_one\\_years\\_of\\_assisted\\_suicide.pdf?1552018763](https://assets.nationbuilder.com/australiancarealliance/pages/96/attachments/original/1552018763/Oregon_-_Twenty_one_years_of_assisted_suicide.pdf?1552018763)

<sup>37</sup> <https://www.doh.wa.gov/Portals/1/Documents/Pubs/422-109-DeathWithDignityAct2017.pdf>

Some supporters of assisted suicide **don't care if some people are bullied into killing themselves** under an assisted suicide law.

Dr Henry Marsh, a British neurosurgeon and proponent of legalising assisted suicide and euthanasia, has acknowledged the possibility of coercion and elder abuse leading to wrongful deaths under such a law but he simply doesn't care:

*"Even if a few grannies get bullied into [suicide], isn't that the price worth paying for all the people who could die with dignity?"*<sup>38</sup>

It is clear from this evidence that simply requiring a physician to tick a box stating the person requesting assisted suicide is doing so voluntarily is no guarantee that the physician has the competence or has undertaken the extensive and careful inquiries necessary to establish that the person is not subject to undue influence or subtle pressure (albeit unwittingly) from family, friends or society to request assisted suicide so as not to burden others.

Victoria's *Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2017*, for example, requires the two assessing doctors, as well as the witness to an administration request in the case of euthanasia, to certify that the person requesting assisted suicide or euthanasia is "*acting voluntarily and without coercion*".

Assessing doctors are required to complete training approved by the Secretary of the Department of Health on "*identifying and assessing risk factors for abuse or coercion*".

The section in the prescribed training that covers assessing voluntariness, including assessing the absence of coercion, totals just over 5 minutes consisting of a 2 minute 20 second video and slides which take a further 2 minutes 50 seconds to read. This obviously cannot guarantee that assessing doctors never miss the signs of coercion or abuse.

This approved training was prepared by Ben White, who as a co-author of an article entitled "*Biggest decision of them all – death and assisted dying: capacity assessments and undue influence screening*", [published](#) in the *Internal Medicine Journal* in January 2019, dissented from the recommendations of his co-authors proposed "*Guideline for clinicians assessing capacity and screening for undue Influence for voluntary assisted dying*".

Issues identified in this insightful report but **completely ignored in the training prepared by White** for Victorian doctors include:

- *undiagnosed depression;*
- *cognitive impairment associated with Motor Neuron Disease and its effect on decision making capacity;*
- *the use of supported decision making "allowing one person to communicate or assist with communicating another's decision raises concerns about potential for undue influence, especially given the gravity of the assisted suicide or euthanasia decision".*

---

<sup>38</sup> <https://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/879187>

And of course, the lay witness to a final euthanasia administration request has no training whatsoever and may have never met the person before – or alternatively be the person coercing the request!

No jurisdiction that has legalised assisted suicide has ever made any serious effort to establish a genuinely safe framework in this regard. Indeed no such framework is possible.

Any law permitting assisted suicide or euthanasia will inevitably result in wrongful deaths from coercion and undue influence.

### Social contagion of suicide

Legalising assisted suicide for some Tasmanians undermines the commitment to **suicide prevention for all** Tasmanians.

Proposals to legalise assisted suicide or euthanasia for a select group of people, such as the terminally or chronically ill, necessarily imply that society agrees such people may be better off dead and supports their suicide as a legitimate, rational choice to be facilitated rather than prevented.



*Cartoon courtesy of Second Thoughts Connecticut<sup>39</sup>*

<sup>39</sup> <https://sites.google.com/site/secondthoughtsconnecticut/>

The question arises as to how publicly and openly aiding suicide for one group of Tasmanians fits with the public policy goal, widely shared across the whole community, to reduce the incidence of suicide?

The Tasmanian Suicide Prevention Strategy (2016-20) noted that:

*effective suicide prevention requires a community-wide response (p. 6)*

*Every life lost to suicide is one too many. It causes pain and distress to individuals, families and communities across Tasmania. (p.8)*

*we need to ensure that fewer people in our state are affected by the distress associated with suicidal thoughts and behaviours. (p.8).<sup>40</sup>*

However, legalising assisted suicide has been shown to lead to **an increase in the overall rate of suicides of 6.3% and of the elderly (65 years and older) by 14.5%.**

Proponents of assisted suicide have claimed that providing the elderly, terminally ill with a legal lethal dose of drugs to facilitate assisted suicide will reduce the incidence of other forms of suicide among this group and, because, it is claimed, many of those for whom the lethal dose is prescribed may never take it, actually decrease the overall suicide rate.

This hypothesis has been subjected to careful scrutiny in [an important study](#) by David Albert Jones and David Paton comparing trends in suicide rates in those states of the United States which have legalised assisted suicide compared to those which have not.<sup>41</sup>

The study, which controlled for various socio-economic factors, unobservable state- and year effects, and state-specific linear trends, found that legalizing assisted suicide was associated with a 6.3% increase in total suicides (i.e. including assisted suicides).

This effect was significantly larger in the over 65-year-old age group with **a massive 14.5% increase in total suicides.**

The introduction of legalised assisted suicide was not associated with a reduction in non-assisted suicide rates, nor with an increase in the mean age of non-assisted suicide.

The conclusion is that assisted suicide either does not inhibit (nor acts as an alternative to) non-assisted suicide, or that it acts in this way in some individuals but is associated with an increased inclination to suicide in other individuals.

---

<sup>40</sup>

[https://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0014/214412/151152\\_DHHS\\_Suicide\\_Prevention\\_Strategy\\_Final\\_WCAG.pdf](https://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0014/214412/151152_DHHS_Suicide_Prevention_Strategy_Final_WCAG.pdf)

<sup>41</sup> <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6df3/55333ceecc41b361da6dc996d90a17b96e9c.pdf>

The latter suggestion would be consistent with the [well known Werther effect of suicide contagion](#) whereby suicide rates increase whenever **suicide is presented in a positive light** as a romantic or rational act.<sup>42</sup>

The legal fiction proposed by section 138 of the Bill that death by ingesting a substance with the intention to cause one's own death is not suicide if you have a validly issued "Private self-administration certificate" under section 84 of the Bill is just that – a legal fiction. The reality of suicide, and its impact on families and the community, is not changed by playing with words.

### **Killed without request or while resisting**

Those who are killed **without any request** by doctors who have grown used to the practice of ending their patients' lives are clearly wrongful deaths. In some cases a doctor has performed euthanasia even where a person resisted.

In the Netherlands in [2015](#) there were 431 cases of euthanasia without explicit request, representing 6.06% (or more than one out of sixteen) of all euthanasia deaths.<sup>43</sup>

More than 1 in 200 (0.52%) of all deaths (other than sudden and expected deaths) of 17-65 year olds in the Netherlands are caused intentionally by euthanasia without an explicit request from the person being killed.

In Case 2016-85 the Review Committees found that a doctor had not acted with due diligence in administering euthanasia to a woman with Alzheimer's disease. The woman had made a general reference in a living will to wanting euthanasia at the "right time". At the time the doctor euthanased her she was incompetent to voluntarily request it.

The doctor put medication in her coffee to reduce her consciousness deliberately so as to avoid her resisting being given drugs. Nonetheless she physically struggled against the administration of an intravenous lethal injection. **She was physically restrained by family members while the doctor completed the administration of the lethal drugs.**<sup>44</sup>

On 13 June 2018, the Regional Disciplinary Court for Healthcare in The Hague considered a complaint against the doctor brought by the Inspectorate for Health Care and Youth. The [decision](#) was published on 24 July 2018.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00048670701266680>

<sup>43</sup> <https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/en/dataset/81655ENG/table?ts=1525401083207>

<sup>44</sup> [https://english.euthanasiecommissie.nl/binaries/euthanasiecommissie-en/documents/publications/annual-reports/2002/annual-reports/annual-reports/RTE\\_annual\\_report\\_2016.pdf](https://english.euthanasiecommissie.nl/binaries/euthanasiecommissie-en/documents/publications/annual-reports/2002/annual-reports/annual-reports/RTE_annual_report_2016.pdf)

<sup>45</sup> <https://www.tuchtcollege-gezondheidszorg.nl/binaries/tuchtcolleges-gezondheidszorg/documenten/publicaties/documentatie-procedures/uitspraken/uitspraken-van-persberichten/beslissing-euthanasie-bij-dementie/2018-033bes.pdf>

The Court found that the written declaration of intent was not sufficiently clear to justify euthanasia in this case. It also found that the doctor should have tried to discuss the execution of euthanasia with the patient beforehand.

Despite its finding that the doctor had seriously breached the requirements for euthanasia it only imposed a reprimand on the doctor.

On 9 November 2018 it was [announced](#) that a criminal investigation into this case by the Board of Public Prosecutors had concluded and that the doctor would be prosecuted.<sup>46</sup>

**This was the first time that the Dutch Public Prosecution Service (OM) prosecuted a doctor for euthanasia since the introduction of the Act on Termination of Life on Request and Assisted Suicide in 2002.**

*After extensive investigation, the public prosecutor came to the conclusion that the nursing home doctor had not acted in accordance with the legal standards. The public prosecutor considers it important **that the court assesses whether the doctor was entitled to rely on the living will completed by the woman.** In addition, the OM reproaches the physician that she assumed that the woman still wanted to die without verifying this with the woman. Although the woman had regularly stated that she wanted to die, on other occasions she had said that she did not want to die. In the opinion of the OM, **the doctor should have checked with the woman whether she still had a death wish by discussing this with her.** The fact that she had become demented does not alter this, because according to the Public Prosecution, the law also requires the doctor to verify the euthanasia request in such a situation. **These two legal questions on the termination of life of people suffering from dementia justify the submission of this case to the criminal court judge.***

Unfortunately, a subsequent decision of the Dutch Supreme Court not only exonerated the doctor in this case but effectively **affirmed that forcible euthanasia of a person verbally and actively resisting being killed was justified based on an advanced directive requesting euthanasia** – even if that advanced directive was somewhat ambivalent as to its precise meaning.<sup>47</sup>

While the current Bill does not provide for the use of advanced directives for euthanasia this end game of the Dutch experience should give pause before starting down a path that logically implies such a barbaric outcome.

---

<sup>46</sup> <https://www.om.nl/vaste-onderdelen/zoeken/@104443/nursing-home-doctor/>

<sup>47</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/21/dutch-court-approves-euthanasia-in-cases-of-advanced-dementia>

## Lacking decision-making capacity

In a landmark study of decision making capacity of persons with terminal cancer and a prognosis of less than six months to live<sup>48</sup> – that is a cohort that would be eligible for assisted suicide under the schemes in Oregon and other US States as well as under the Bill – 90% were found to be impaired in regard to at least one of the four elements of decision making – Choice (15% impaired), Understanding (44%), Appreciation (49%) and Reasoning (85%).

Under the Bill (s12 (2) (a)) *“a person is to be taken to have decision-making capacity in relation to a decision unless there is evidence to the contrary”*.

This study suggests that, at least in the case of persons with cancer and a prognosis of less than six months to live, it would be more prudent to start from the presumption that they are likely to have impaired decision-making capacity unless it is demonstrated to the contrary.

The study also found a significant discrepancy between physician assessments of decision-making capacity compared to the actual decision-making capacity as tested on the MacCAT-T scales.

Physicians assessed as “unimpaired” 64% of those who, according to the MacCAT-T assessment had impaired Reasoning; 70% who had impaired Appreciation; 61% who had impaired Understanding and 100% of those who had impaired Choice.

This lack of ability of physicians who are actually caring for terminally ill cancer patients with a prognosis of less than six months to live to accurately assess their patients’ decision making capacity is likely to be exceeded in flawed assessments of decision making capacity by other doctors – who do not necessarily have an established relationship with the person – making an assessment of decision making capacity in relation to a request for assisted suicide.

Schemes like those in Oregon and Victoria provide for assessing doctors to refer to a specialist for an assessment of decision-making capacity but this is **purely optional** on the part of those doctors. In Oregon in 2018 only 3 out of 168 people (1.78%) who died by assisted suicide under the Oregon law were referred by the prescribing doctor to a psychiatrist or psychologist for consultation on whether or not the person was not “capable” due to “impaired judgement”.

Oregon and Washington report data on the length of time between a person requesting a lethal substance for the purpose of assisted suicide and actually ingesting the substance.

In Oregon in 2018 one person ingested lethal medication 807 days (2 years 2 ½ months) after the initial request for the lethal prescription was made. The longest duration between initial request and ingestion recorded is 1009 days (that is 2 years and 9 months). In Washington the data shows that in each year between 5% and 17% of those who die after requesting a lethal dose do so more than 25 weeks later with one person in 2012 dying nearly 3 years (150 weeks) later, one person in 2015 dying nearly two years later (95 weeks) and one person in 2016 dying more than two years (112 weeks) later.

---

<sup>48</sup> Elissa Kolva et al., “Assessing the decision making capacity of terminally ill patients with cancer”, American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 2018 May; 26(5): 523–531, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6345171/pdf/nihms937741.pdf>

Clearly in these cases there is a real possibility that, even if a person was correctly assessed as having decision making capacity at the time of the request they may well have since become impaired in their decision making capacity before actually ingesting the lethal substance.

Under their schemes (and under similar schemes in other US States, as well as in Victoria and under the Bill) the only assessment of decision-making capacity is carried out at the time of the request. There is no assessment of decision-making capacity at the time the lethal substance is ingested.

This obviously creates the opportunity for **subtle or overt coercion**, or for deceptive administration of the lethal substance by a family member or carer. However, it also makes it possible for the person to voluntarily ingest the lethal substance but without a full appreciation or understanding of what they are doing and without making a reasoned decision to do so.

Given that, even if doctors assessing decision making capacity improved their skills beyond the present very poor level, there will still be persons who are mistakenly assessed as having decision making capacity who actually are impaired in their ability to understand, appreciate or make a reasoned decision about assisted suicide or euthanasia, there will inevitably be wrongful deaths from lack of capacity.

Additionally, in those jurisdictions which allow persons requesting a lethal substance for assisted suicide to be prescribed and supplied with the lethal substance for later ingestion there is a very real possibility that some of these people will have impaired decision making capacity by the time (perhaps weeks, months or even years later) when they actually ingest it. These too will die a wrongful death.

The Bill specifically provides for self-administration of a lethal poison provided under the Act up to 12 months after it is supplied to a person with no provision for reviewing the person's decision-making capacity during that period.

## **INHUMANE DEATHS BY ASSISTED SUICIDE AND EUTHANASIA**

The case for legalising assisted suicide and euthanasia **simplistically assumes** that once legalised such deaths will be both rapid and peaceful. However, this is not the case. As [a recent article](#) in the journal *Anaesthesia* found:

*Complications related to assisted dying methods were found to include difficulty in swallowing the prescribed dose ( $\leq 9\%$ ), a relatively high incidence of vomiting ( $\leq 10\%$ ), prolongation of death (by as much as seven days in  $\leq 4\%$ ), and failure to induce coma, where patients re-awoke and even sat up ( $\leq 1.3\%$ ).*

*This raises a concern that some deaths may be inhumane.*

Deaths by assisted suicide or euthanasia that are inhumane are wrongful deaths. Unless such deaths can be ruled out then a scheme to legalise assisted suicide or euthanasia should be rejected. It simply doesn't meet the test of delivering what it claims: a rapid, peaceful death.

Technical problems, complications and problems with completion in the administration of lethal drugs for euthanasia have been [reported](#) from the Netherlands.

Technical problems occurred in 5% of cases. The most common technical problems were difficulty finding a vein in which to inject the drug and difficulty administering an oral medication.

Complications occurred in 3% of cases of euthanasia, including spasm or myoclonus (muscular twitching), cyanosis (blue colouring of the skin), nausea or vomiting, tachycardia (rapid heartbeat), excessive production of mucus, hiccups, perspiration, and extreme gasping. In one case the patient's eyes remained open, and in another case, the patient sat up.

In 10% of cases the person took longer than expected to die (median 3 hours) with one person taking up to 7 days.

From 2016 to July 2018 the Board of Procurators General [reported](#) on 11 cases of euthanasia with serious breach of protocols by the doctor, including a failed assisted suicide because the doctor ordered the wrong drug; **seven cases of the muscle relaxant being administered when the person was not in a full coma and therefore potentially causing pain**; and three cases where a first attempt at euthanasia failed and the doctor had to leave the person to get a second batch of lethal drugs.

In Oregon in 2018 one in nine (11.11%) of those for whom information about the circumstances of their deaths is available either had difficulty ingesting or regurgitated the lethal dose or had other complications. We simply do not know about the other eight out of nine cases.

Two people in Oregon had seizures in [2017](#) after ingesting the lethal poison.

The interval from ingestion of lethal drugs to unconsciousness has been as long as four hours (in 2017).

The time from ingestion to death has been as long as 104 hours (4 days and 8 hours). One person in 2018 took 14 hours to die.

A total of 8 people have regained consciousness after taking the supposedly lethal dose, including one person in 2018.

Two of the cases of regaining consciousness occurred after using DDMP2 – the latest experimental lethal cocktail being used by pro-assisted suicide doctors.

In Washington State in [2017](#) one person took 6 hours to lose consciousness after ingesting the lethal dose and one person took 35 hours to die after ingesting the lethal dose. In [2016](#) one person took 11 hours to lose consciousness after ingesting the lethal dose. In [2015](#) one person took 72 hours (3 days) to die after ingesting the dose. In [2013](#) one person took 3 hours to lose consciousness after ingesting the lethal dose and one person took 41 hours (1 day and 17 hours) to die after ingesting the dose. In [2009](#) two people awakened after initially losing consciousness. In [2014](#) one person suffered seizures after ingesting the lethal medication.

At least 18 patients have regurgitated the lethal medication. Seven of these cases occurred in [2016](#) alone.

This may be related to the use of new experimental cocktails of lethal drugs being used since the price of the previously used drugs, secobarbital and pentobarbital (Nembutal), escalated.

The first of the new cocktails is a mix of phenobarbital, chloral hydrate and morphine sulfate. It was prescribed in 88 cases in [2015](#) and 106 cases in [2016](#) but no longer prescribed in 2017 no doubt due to the fact that it was [found to be very caustic](#) and to cause a profound burning in the throat.

The second experimental cocktail includes morphine sulfate, propranolol, diazepam, digoxin and a buffer suspension (DDMP2). It was used in 4 cases in [2015](#), 53 cases in [2016](#) and 130 cases (66%) in [2017](#).

This latest attempt at an experimental lethal cocktail aimed at delivering a rapid and peaceful death is a failure.

The [2018 Data Summary](#) from Oregon reports on 43 cases of (attempted or completed) assisted suicide using DDMP2 where the results were observed and recorded.

12 people out of 43 (27.9%) died between 13 and 59 minutes of ingesting the lethal cocktail.

19 people (44.18%) died between 1 and 6 hours of ingesting the lethal cocktail.

10 people (23.2%) **or almost one out of four people took between 6 and 21 hours to die** after ingesting the lethal cocktail.

2 people (4.65%) regained consciousness and did not die after ingesting the (supposedly) lethal cocktail.

**No scheme for assisted suicide and euthanasia so far enacted or proposed can guarantee a humane, rapid and peaceful death.**

The Bill does (s82(3)(d)(i) and s 88) acknowledge the possibility of complications and makes some provisions for dealing with these in relation to administration by or self-administration in the presence of a health practitioner. While mentioning the possibility of administering a further dose of a “VAD substance” in these sections there is no further provision in the Bill for how an authorised health practitioner would come to have spare doses of a “VAD substance” at this point.

Furthermore, there is no provision – and no evident way – for ensuring that when a person self-administers a substance prescribed and provided to them under the Act and complications arise that the person – and those around them – are spared pain and distress.

## QUEENSLAND COURT OF APPEAL DECISION ON AIDING SUICIDE: A RED FLAG TO CREATING AN EXEMPTION TO SECTION 163 OF THE TASMANIAN CRIMINAL CODE

In a unanimous decision by three judges of the Queensland Court of Appeal handed down in Brisbane on 19 June 2020 in the case of *R v Morant [2020] QCA 135*, Graham Morant's appeal against his conviction for aiding the suicide of his wife was rejected on all four grounds of appeal and the sentence of 10 years imprisonment was upheld as fair.

Morant was convicted on two counts under s311 of the Queensland Criminal Code. The first was that he had counselled Ms Morant to kill herself and thereby induced her to do so. The second was that he had aided her in killing herself.

One of the grounds of appeal was the belated discovery of two emails Ms Morant had exchanged with Dr Philip Nitschke. The emails presumably showed that she had suicidal ideation and was actively considering means of suicide.

However, these things were already apparent from evidence presented at Mr Morant's trial. As Sofronoff P concluded (at 38):

*The evidence could not have helped the appellant. It would, instead, have reinforced Ms Morant's vulnerability to the appellant's inducements.*

Sofronoff P explains (at 47):

*It was implicit in the jury's verdicts that the appellant had counselled Ms Morant to kill herself with the intention that she should commit suicide. It also follows that the jury found that the counselling was effective to induce her to commit suicide so that, but for the appellant's counselling, she would not have gassed herself on 30 November 2014.*

Morant stood to benefit from three life insurance policies to the total of \$1.4 million.

His efforts to induce his wife to commit suicide included recounting to her a story about "a customer of his [who] had taken out policies of insurance in favour of his wife and had then killed himself." Mr Morant told his wife that that was "an amazing and wonderful thing" to have done. He encouraged her to do the same for him.

Sofronoff P concluded (at 64-65):

*The present case is a paradigm case that exhibits **the wickedness** of the offence of counselling and thereby inducing a victim to kill herself. The offence was committed against a woman who was vulnerable to the appellant's inducements. His actions were premeditated, calculated and were done for financial gain... The offence was a serious one that involved a killing of a human being.*

One of the judges, Boddice J summarised (at 248-249) the case against Graham Morant:

*[T]he deceased was a vulnerable person with difficulties with her physical health, who was already suffering depression; and the fact that the appellant, by his conduct, took*

*advantage of those vulnerabilities in order to persuade her to kill herself and then assisted her to do so.*

*In addition to those matters, the more serious aspect of the offences, counselling suicide, occurred over a period of months. Its seriousness was aggravated by the fact that the appellant had also aided the deceased to kill herself, being the end result of that extended period of counselling.*

This case should be a **big red flag** to Tasmanians in considering legislation that would effectively provide an exemption to the equivalent provision in the Tasmanian Criminal Code s163, which provides that:

*Any person who instigates or aids another to kill himself is guilty of a crime.*

**If Tasmania passes a law permitting euthanasia and assisted suicide it will be removing from vulnerable Tasmanians - like Ms Morant - the protection of Section 163 with its absolute prohibition on instigating and aiding a person to kill themselves.**

Manipulative, greedy, coercive, murderous perpetrators like Graham Morant, will simply need to suggest to a vulnerable spouse or parent or “friend” that accessing legal doctor provided euthanasia or taking doctor prescribed lethal poison is “*all for the best dear*”.

Section 123 of the Bill would create a new offence of offering an inducement to a person or exercising dishonest or undue influence to induce a person, to make a request or give final permission for euthanasia or assisted suicide under the Act. And section 128 would create a similar offence of “*by dishonest or undue influence*” inducing a person to self-administer a “VAD substance”.

However, these offences would be exceedingly difficult to prosecute in the face of the broad immunity granted by section 132 of the Bill to acts done “in good faith”, including assisting a person to “participate in [any stage of] the voluntary assisted dying process”.

Under section 5 of the Bill the “voluntary assisted dying process” includes (a) a first request, (s) a final permission and, significantly, (x) self-administration of the lethal substance – in some case with no other witness present.

Someone who forcibly administered a lethal substance supplied under the Act for self-administration without a witness within 6 or 12 months of supply to a person who had, in the meantime lost decision-making capacity, may not even be committing an offence provided “good faith” could be claimed. “*I thought that is what she would have wanted!*”

## **CONCLUSION**

Any proposal to change the law on murder and on instigating and aiding suicide to exempt doctors who prescribe and/or administer lethal poison to a specified category of persons requires the most careful scrutiny.

How will such a scheme avoid wrongful deaths?

How will such a scheme guarantee a humane, rapid and peaceful death?

The evidence cited above, drawn principally from official reports from jurisdictions such as the Netherlands, Belgium, Oregon and Washington State shows conclusively that no such scheme has yet been found.

For a full analysis of all eighteen jurisdictions where assisted suicide and/or euthanasia have been legalised see our publication [\*Fatally Flawed Experiments\*](#).<sup>49</sup>

For further information on wrongful deaths see our publication [\*Twelve Categories of Wrongful Death\*](#).<sup>50</sup>

**Based on this evidence we urge the Review to be honest and transparent in its report - either explaining exactly how the Bill could be amended to guarantee that there will not be a single wrongful or inhumane death in Tasmania or openly admitting that it cannot be amended to guarantee this and that there will inevitably and unavoidably be wrongful and inhumane deaths if the Bill becomes law.**

---

<sup>49</sup> [https://www.australiancarealliance.org.au/flawed\\_experiments](https://www.australiancarealliance.org.au/flawed_experiments)

<sup>50</sup> [https://www.australiancarealliance.org.au/wrongful\\_categories](https://www.australiancarealliance.org.au/wrongful_categories)