



'The right to die is as inviolable as the right to life' Sir Mark Oliphant

“Bill gets buried, but not dead yet”

... So reports *The Advertiser* in an article (1) on the failed Upper House attempt for voluntary euthanasia law reform under the Bill co-sponsored by Greens MLC, the Hon Mark Parnell, and the Hon Steph Key in the Lower House. Mr Parnell spoke of his disappointment at the Bill's defeat 'on the voices', but announced that it would be back on the agenda in the Upper House if supported in the Lower House in 2011.

The public gallery of the Legislative Council was at full capacity with both supporters and opponents of the Bill witnessing another historic SA debate on legislative change which lasted for several hours. During the debate Labor members Carmel Zollo and Bernard Finnigan, and Liberal members Terry Stephens, David Ridgway, Stephen Wade, Jing Lee, Rob Lucas and Michelle Lensink indicated they would vote against the Bill; as did the Independent Ann Bressington.

Labor MLCs Ian Hunter, John Gazzola and Gail Gago, the Independent John Darley, Liberal John Dawkins, and Kelly Vincent (Dignity for Disability) all spoke in favour of the Bill; as did the Speaker Bob Sneath. While space does not permit coverage of all supportive voices, a few quotations follow from across the above political spectrum. These are from the Hon Ian Hunter, Hon Tammy Franks, Hon John Dawkins, and Hon Kelly Vincent.

Mr Hunter reiterated what he had already placed on the public record, including the statement:

... This issue even crosses the religious divide, with 85 per cent of people in a 2007 Newspoll survey who indicated that they supported voluntary euthanasia identifying themselves as Christian. I note that result with interest; it seems that the vast majority of self-professed Christians know very clearly where they stand on this issue, notwithstanding what religious leaders might be saying about it (2).

The Hon Tammy Franks argued:
Opponents often claim that it is impossible to make a bill that will not be abused. That is equivalent to saying that there should not be road speed limit laws because people might speed. The point of law is to spell out to our citizens what is acceptable and, conversely, what will be prosecuted.

INSIDE

Steadfast denial of the facts.....	2
Hawke Centre forum	5
World Federation conference	5
VE advocacy groups update	6
Lawyers Supporting Choice for VE.....	7
Farewell to a Queensland advocate.....	8
Australia Institute Survey on VE.....	8
World News.....	9
Cancer Council Relay for Life	10
Christians for VE membership form.....	10
SAVES AGM and membership form	11
SAVES primary aim and committee.....	12

Unlike current clandestine medical practice, in which patients are euthanased with no operational framework, no ethical guidelines, no requirement for multiple medical opinions, no specific assessment of the patient's mental capacity, no cooling off period, no documentary trail, no witnesses or signatures and no oversight or reporting, this voluntary euthanasia bill makes the process explicit.

The Hon John Dawkins also reiterated what he had earlier placed on the public record (3), stating: *By passing this bill, we would not be imposing voluntary euthanasia on those who are opposed to it, but we would be giving everyone the choice. I support the bill.*

The Hon Kelly Vincent told the chamber that *Dignity for Disability* does not have a specific policy on voluntary euthanasia. She stated that their motto is 'Dignity through choice'. Ms Vincent argued that it must be an informed choice but that: *I believe that those wanting to end their life for the right reasons should have that choice ... It has been a great struggle for me to come to this decision ... but I will conclude by saying that if I believe in the human right to a dignified and peaceful life that is driven by autonomy and choice, then I must vote for the rights of South Australians to a peaceful and self-driven dignified death.*

In a gracious closing gesture to all MPs charged with dealing with this issue, Mr Parnell stated: *For those people who have left the door open, I thank you. Some people have left the door ajar, others have left it with the safety latch on, and some members have welded the door shut, and I will not name those members. For some members, it would not matter what bill was before us, it would not matter what safeguards there were, whether it was a minimalist model or a maximalist model (if there is such a word), they would vote against voluntary euthanasia. However, I am still encouraged by the things that people have said*

today, even those who have indicated that they will not support this bill tonight but that the door is open for their later support.

The *VE Bulletin* will report on any further legislative developments.

References:

- (1) Sarah Martin, *The Advertiser*, 25 November 2010.
- (2) Hansard 28 October 2009
- (3) *ibid*

Steadfast denial of the facts with people forced to suffer

Supportive voices have been outlined above, with SAVES president Frances Coombe giving her assessment of some of the arguments presented on November 24th in opposition to the Key/Parnell Bill:

Arguably, the defeat of the Key/Parnell Bill in the Legislative Council on November 24th 2010 signifies the abandonment by some Members of Parliament, of empirical evidence as a criterion by which to consider proposed voluntary euthanasia legislation. This seems to be the only conclusion to be drawn from the Hansard record of Members below who spoke against the Bill.

It is the responsibility of our lawmakers to examine the harm and the good of Bills before them. For many years the SAVES executive has adopted an evidence-based approach in their intensive lobbying around the need for voluntary euthanasia law reform. What we appear to be encountering is a steadfast denial of the evidence by some members. Surely constituents should be accorded more respect from our elected representatives?

The Hon Carmel Zollo, a member of the Legislative Council since 1997 states: *Euthanasia puts enormous pressure on the frail aged to do away with themselves in order to lessen the distress they believe they are causing their family.*

However, a multi-year analysis of data from Oregon and the Netherlands by Battin et al. (1) found no evidence that people in nine of 10 vulnerable groups died more often as a result of either physician assisted suicide or euthanasia. If anything, the study showed that people taking advantage of the laws tended to be slightly better off economically and better educated than average. Battin et al. note a further study from the Netherlands in which:

There is no evidence for a higher frequency of euthanasia among the elderly, people with low economic status, the poor, the physically disabled or chronically ill, minors, people with psychiatric illnesses including depression, or racial or ethnic minorities, compared with background populations.

In her speech Ms Zollo also asserted that palliative care is the answer to euthanasia. While our palliative care is excellent, it can never be 100% effective. It is widely acknowledged, including by Palliative Care Australia and the AMA, that even the best palliative care cannot help all patients: that between five and ten per cent find their suffering so unbearable that they persistently request an assisted death.

Ms Zollo also made the claim that legislation can never be guaranteed to have sufficient safeguards. Apparently, the mere claim that it is impossible to enact a voluntary euthanasia law that is not open to abuse is supposed to just settle the matter. Of course it doesn't, for if we lived by this philosophy there would be no laws for fear of having them broken. It is the responsibility of lawmakers to craft sound laws that minimise circumvention and hold societal practices accountable to scrutiny. Current laws prohibiting the choice for voluntary euthanasia fail on both counts.

The Hon Rob Lucas stated, in his opposition to the Bill:

It is my job as a legislator, having been elected to this parliament for a term of office, to listen to

the views of my electorate, to respect those views of the electorate and then to make a considered judgement on every issue.

One may ask how the views of the electorate can be respected if they are consistently ignored: surely considered judgement includes the proper regard for evidence, by all legislators.

Another common assertion is that voluntary euthanasia is against the Hippocratic Oath, as claimed by the Hon Robert Brokenshire when arguing against the Bill. He stated 'In my opinion, euthanasia erodes trust in the medical profession. It runs against the Hippocratic oath'. However, the Hippocratic Oath was in use 2,400 years ago. It began by swearing to Apollo and to all the gods and goddesses. The Oath also states that the doctor will teach his art without fee or stipulation. Few if any medical schools require their students to take the original form of the Oath. The Hippocratic Oath and the injunction to 'do no harm' are often cited as a defense against supporting assisted dying. However, avoiding harm is not always possible, as many medical procedures have negative side effects, and doctors need to evaluate harms and benefits before advising a course of action in many different medical contexts.

Although doctors are expert advisors it is the patient who makes the ultimate decision on which treatment, or none, represents the greater benefit and lesser harm. An incurably ill patient with unremitting suffering may decide, after consultation and advice, that a peaceful death is the lesser harm. While demanding the highest ethical standards, the Hippocratic Oath does not rule out the possibility of circumstances arising in which requested help to a hastened death may rightly be given.

Another aspect of Hon Robert Brokenshire's stated opposition to the Bill was in the claim:

I have been told that in the Northern Territory Aboriginal people became less inclined to see a doctor for fear of being euthanased. I have no doubt others in our community will do the same.

However, to address such arguments promulgated at the time of the Northern Territory Act, a formal inquiry was undertaken in 1997 by the NT Government. This concluded:

There is no evidence from hospital separations or patient travel data that the introduction of the Euthanasia Act affected the willingness of Aboriginal people to present to hospital for medical treatment (2).

The Hon Robert Brokenshire also made the claim that ‘the experience from jurisdictions with euthanasia legislation that has seen the killing of people against their will’. Chambers 21st Century Dictionary defines ‘killing’ as ‘an act of slaying’ or infers an act of violence, against a person’s will. Mr Brokenshire appears to be claiming that people are murdered as a result of voluntary euthanasia being legal in some jurisdictions.

To support his opposition to the Bill the Hon Bernard Finnigan focused in part on denying the validity of opinion polls that show overwhelming support for law reform. Mr Finnigan argued:

One of the most common arguments, again, that gets brought up in favour of euthanasia is the level of public support, and we have heard that many times in this debate in this house; that over 80 per cent, 85 per cent whatever figure gets thrown around of the population support active voluntary euthanasia. Again, I would make the points as I did in my previous contribution, first, is this figure right? That is a very difficult thing, I think, to assess.

I am not doubting the results of the Newspolls, and so on, but I do doubt how valuable that guide is to people’s genuine views on the matter when they consider the totality of what it means to legalise euthanasia. It is our most fundamental duty to ensure that those people get world-class

health care, support and protection, that those honourable people get compassion and love, and not a lethal injection. I urge honourable members to oppose the bill.

The Hon Dennis Hood adopted a similar argument in respect of polls consistently showing around 80% public support for choice for voluntary euthanasia. He stated ‘We often hear with respect to the debate on euthanasia that some 80 per cent of the population favours it. I have even heard people quote figures of 85 per cent. I strongly reject those figures’ (3). However, reputable professional survey companies including Roy Morgan Research and Newspoll Market and Research have, over more than 20 years, applied their rigorous survey methods on the clear question:

If a hopelessly ill patient, experiencing unrelievable suffering, with absolutely no chance of recovering, asks for a lethal dose, should a doctor be allowed to give a lethal dose or not ?

The November 2010 Australia Institute poll on attitudes to voluntary euthanasia followed the same line of questioning. It also showed consistent

Just a reminder....

SAVES public meetings are held three times a year at 2.15 pm on Sunday afternoons at the Disability Information and Research Centre (DIRC) 195 Gilles St Adelaide.

This is an important forum for updating members on SAVES’ activities, legislative issues and relevant local, national and international events and initiatives.

Guest speakers provide a further informative dimension, including informal discussion over tea and coffee.

The next public meetings are on **3rd April, 24th July and 23rd October.**

Make a diary note now!

results with other recent polls, and is published in summary later in this bulletin. Unfortunately, space does not permit further discussion of the arguments used to scuttle a Bill which supports the clearly stated wishes of the overwhelming majority of South Australians.

It is disgraceful that world wide evidence of voluntary euthanasia laws working responsibly can be ignored and smothered. It is outrageous that public policy can be decided on spurious grounds. It is an unspeakable cruelty that the minority whose suffering can not be alleviated by even the best of medical care are forced to continue suffering because of moral busybodies.

References:

- (1) Battin MP et al. 2007 'Legal Physician-assisted dying in Oregon and the Netherlands: evidence concerning the impact on patients in 'vulnerable' groups', *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 33: 591-597.
- (2) 1997 *Euthanasia Inquiry*, Chapter 5, p. 52 and Appendix 3 (Northern Territory Government).
- (3) Hansard 10th November 2010, p. 1432 (adjourned debate from Sept 29th).

'Dying with Dignity: assisted dying principles and practices'

On the 22nd October 2010 the Bob Hawke Prime Ministerial Centre at Uni SA hosted a forum to explain how legislation works in practice in both Belgium and Oregon USA. Professor Jan Bernheim, medical oncologist Faculty of Medicine Vrije Universiteit Brussels and researcher End-of-life-care Belgium, and Mr Neil Francis, Chairman and CEO of YourLastRight.com were the two guest speakers. The forum was also attended by the Hon Mark Parnell and the Hon Steph Key whose joint Bill was due for consideration in the Upper House.

Professor Bernheim spoke of his experience of the assisted-dying law in force in Belgium since 2002, arguing that assisted dying and palliative

care are not mutually exclusive but go hand-in-hand. Professor Bernheim was a key speaker at the World Federation of Right to Die Global Biennial Conference 2010 held in Melbourne between the 6th and 9th October.

Mr Francis discussed the weaknesses of existing Australian laws and explained the operations of the Oregon 1997 *Death with Dignity Act* following his recent visit to Oregon to consult with key figures working within the operations of the Act.

World Federation Conference October 2010

The World Federation of Right to Die Societies Conference held in Melbourne between the 6th and 9th October attracted 83 people from twelve countries and 37 right-to-die organisations; with the public day attracting 300 interested parties. On October 15th and 16th the Dignity New Zealand Trust also hosted a conference in Wellington NZ. Lesley Martin, founder of the trust arranged the event. Ms Martin's intention to speak at the World Federation Conference was thwarted by her previous conviction of assisting her mother,

Bequests to SAVES

A bequest to SAVES is one way to make a significant gift furthering the aim of the society. This is to achieve law reform to allow choice for voluntary euthanasia. The appropriate wording for the gift of a specific sum is I bequeath to the South Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Society Inc. the sum of \$.....

In the unlikely event that you wish to leave your entire estate to SAVES it would read I give, devise and bequeath the whole of my real and personal estate to the South Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Society Inc.

Joy Martin, to die. As reported in the July 2004 edition of this bulletin Ms Martin was arrested following disclosure in her book *To die like a dog*, and sentenced to fifteen months imprisonment.

Voluntary euthanasia advocacy groups: update

As reported in the previous *VE Bulletin*, and given coverage in the local media (1), several groups have been established which actively support voluntary euthanasia law reform. These groups were approached to provide an update of their activities to keep SAVES members and other readers informed.

SA Nurses Supporting Choices in Dying

Sandra L (Sandy) Bradley who coordinates the group sends the following update:
 “Our group SA Nurses Supporting Choices in Dying is now on Facebook (under the same title) where we post articles, comments and encourage discussion by nurses about the pros and cons involved in legalisation of VE with regard to their nursing practice. Our group would welcome additional members who can email me on sandrabradley2@bigpond.com where they will be kept up to date with the latest progress reports on legalisation of VE in South Australia. Importantly, for nurses to have their voices heard, they will need to speak up and one way of doing this is joining our group and letting us know how they feel about this issue from a nursing perspective so that I can present their views to the parliamentarians who will decide this issue”.

Doctors for AMA Neutrality on Voluntary Euthanasia and

South Australian Doctors Supporting Choice for Voluntary Euthanasia

Dr Rosemary Jones who heads *Doctors for AMA Neutrality on Voluntary Euthanasia*, and Emeritus Professor John Willoughby who heads *South Australian Doctors Supporting Choice for Voluntary Euthanasia*, advise the intended merger of the two groups.

Dr Jones writes letters to the Australian Medical Association on behalf of the group’s members who are all co-signatories. The aim of the group is to convert the Australian Medical Association’s stance of opposition to one of neutrality in line with community standards. Dr Jones believes the merger will further increase the steadily growing membership: now well over 100.

The South Australian Doctors group directly lobbies parliamentarians in support of law reform. This group currently numbers 25 and represents a spectrum from active professionals to retired practitioners. Members approve all communications to MPs and have their names on the letterhead. Professor Willoughby states ‘Some politicians opposed to the legalisation of VE use some remarkably irrelevant reasons for their stance – including that it will put power in the hands of too few ... what does this mean?’ Discussion and clarification of the issue are therefore an important part of this group’s role. As part of the two groups’ merger a national website will be developed, supported by funds from the estate of the late Clem Jones, former Lord Mayor of Brisbane. This will serve to consolidate the merger and support both the membership and combined aims of both existing groups.

Christians Supporting Choice for Voluntary Euthanasia

Ian Wood, the group’s convenor reports:
 Our booklet, *I Want the Choice of a Peaceful Death*, which, in a concise easy to read format **refutes much of the religious opposition to legal Assisted Dying**, continues to be well received. It has 16 pages, and is well illustrated in full colour. The booklets are free to all but donations towards printing and postage are appreciated. Offers to help distribute copies to anyone who may be interested in this approach are most welcome. Orders or queries to Ian Wood, 429 Anzac Road Port Pirie SA 5540, please or phone 08 8632 2272.

We have been pleased to welcome some more Ministers of religion to our group, Christians Supporting Choice for VE, as well as a number of new members from South Australia and also Queensland. Since the disappointing defeat of the Key/Parnell VE Bill in the Legislative Council, lobbying of MPs has been on the “back burner” during the Christmas/New Year recess. However this will start in earnest in line with any further legislative developments. I am delighted that Frances Coombe and SAVES are entering a team in the Cancer Relay for Life in Adelaide, 9/10th April. This is a wonderful initiative to raise funds for cancer research. Please support the team with a donation if you can! I am very sorry I cannot take part myself, but the Cancer Relay in Port Pirie is the same weekend, and I am the team captain for our Choir so will be walking in Port Pirie instead.

South Coast Support Group

Denis Haynes of the above group advises that the group will discuss the possibility of attending the ‘Relay for Life’ (reported on later in this edition) but notes that many of the group’s members are elderly. Members still staff a stall at the local market, talk to people and keep the issue of voluntary euthanasia law reform in the public eye.

Reference:

(1) Sarah Martin, ‘Time for death with dignity’, *The Advertiser*, 6 September 2010

‘Lawyers Supporting Choice for Voluntary Euthanasia’

The following media release of 11th November 2010 announced the formation of another advocacy group:

‘This new group of professionals has been formed to address the cruelty of an unjust law, joining similar groups of nurses, doctors and Christians supporting the legalization of voluntary euthanasia. Founder Russell Jamison says “Our laws have failed to keep pace with the will of the people who overwhelmingly demand change”. The legal professionals in the Lawyers Group support choice for those seeking a dignified end.

The vote in Parliament on the *Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care (End of Life Arrangements) Amendment Bill 2010* Bill – the Key/ Parnell Bill, is an opportunity for politicians to stand up for the rights of their constituents. Mr Jamison urges Members of Parliament to turn

Your Anticipatory Direction

If you have not already completed an Anticipatory Direction, also known as Advance Directive, please do so to ensure that your end of life wishes are respected.

You can choose from the:

(1) Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act 1995.

Forms are available for downloading from the Dept of Health website www.dh.sa.gov.au/consent or may be collected from Service SA, Government Information Centre 108 North Terrace Adelaide, or by ringing the Office of the Public Advocate.

(2) Guardianship and Administration Act 1993.

There is a link to the Office of the Public Advocate from the above website for completing an Enduring Power of Guardianship under this act. Either Anticipatory Direction may be obtained by telephoning the Office of the Public Advocate (08) 8269 7575 or by country free call on 1800 066 969). An Enquiries Officer will answer any queries concerning Anticipatory Directions.

their backs on the vocal minority who believe that the right to choose should be denied to those who are capable of making informed decisions. He says “This proposed legislation has carefully addressed the need for safeguards to protect against the abuses feared by the vocal minority. The time has come to respect the wishes of those at the extreme: those who suffer intolerably and are robbed of all prospect of dignity.” The Lawyers Group wants members of Parliament to acknowledge the fact that the current law prohibiting choice for voluntary euthanasia is in a state of anarchy. It is continually being flouted as doctors knowingly break the law by acceding to patients’ requests for assistance to die, seeing this as following their duty of care to relieve suffering. “It is a shameful law that criminalises a compassionate response to suffering” said Mr Jamison’.

Farewell to a Queensland advocate

John Edge, a Queensland advocate for law reform, ended his life on 8th December 2010. A convenor of the Gold Coast Support Group, John, 74 years, was active in a range of projects: with the most well-known supporting the late Nancy Crick. As reported by *Dying with Dignity Queensland*, it was due to John’s tireless efforts that the world heard of Nancy Crick’s 2001 challenge to Premier Beattie to legislate for law reform so that she and other sufferers could die peacefully and painlessly. Her wish to die surrounded by her friends and relations left all open to prosecution under section 311 of the *Queensland Criminal Code*. John became the key figure among the 22 supporters who stayed with her on the 22nd May 2002 which was the night she ended her life. A two year criminal investigation culminated in raids of the homes of John Edge and Dr Philip Nitschke. A significant outcome following this investigation was the announcement on 18th June by the Queensland Commissioner of Police that ‘being present when someone takes their life does not constitute an offence’.

John later wrote a book about this chapter in the quest for VE law reform entitled ‘Telling it Straight’. He explained in letters he left to friends, colleagues and others, the escalating health issue which had led him to make the decision to end his life. John stated that according to his GP, ‘this will not kill you, it will slow you down, and you’ll live longer and suffer more’. In one letter Mr Edge cited what he claimed were ‘the eloquent words of Seneca to say it all’:

Against all the injuries of life I have the refuge of death. If I can choose between a death of torture and one that is simple and easy, why should I not select the latter? As I choose the ship in which I sail and the house which I shall inhabit, so I will choose the death by which I leave life. In no matter more than death should we act according to our desire ... why should I endure the agonies of disease ... when I can emancipate myself from all my torments?

Vale John.

The Australia Institute survey on attitudes to voluntary euthanasia

The Australia Institute is ‘an independent think tank dedicated to develop and conduct research and policy analysis and to participate forcefully in public debates’ (www.tai.org.au). In November 2010 the Institute conducted an online survey of the attitudes to voluntary euthanasia of 1,294 Australians. The survey met the criteria of a representative sample and asked two questions: *If someone with a terminal illness who is experiencing unrelievable suffering asks to die, should a doctor be allowed to assist them to die?* If the respondent agreed a follow up question asked:

You said that voluntary euthanasia should be legal. In your view, should terminally ill patients also have the option of choosing the time when they die?

The results were reported by gender, age, voter type, and religion.

Results summary question 1

‘Yes’: 75%

‘No’: 13%

‘Not sure’: 12%

By gender: 77% female 73% male

By age: Highest 78% (45-64 years), lowest 70% (18-24 years).

By voter type: Coalition 71%, Labor 79%, Greens 90%, Other 66%.

By religion: Christian 65%, other religions 62%, no religion 90%.

Results summary question 2

Of the 75% who were in support, 83% of women and men alike agreed with the individual also choosing the timing of their death. The percentage supporting the person’s right to time their own death spanned 80% - 88% by age, 82% - 85% by voter type, and 81% - 85% by religion. Full results are available on The Australia Institute website at <https://www.tai.org.au>.

World News**Oregon USA : Annual report on the Death with Dignity Act**

The *VE Bulletin* reports annually on the operation of Oregon’s *Death with Dignity Act* (DWDA). In 2010 59 different physicians provided 96 patients with prescriptions for lethal medication. Of these, 59 patients died from ingesting their medication, 20 died from their underlying illness, with reports still pending on the remainder.

The median age of those dying under DWDA in 2010 was 72 years, with 70.8% over age 65. All were white and had higher level education.

Seventy eight and a half per cent had cancer. Although 92.6% were enrolled in hospice at the time of their deaths 96.9% died in their own homes. In keeping with previous years reports, the most often cited end-of-life concerns were loss of autonomy (93.8%), loss of quality of life (93.8%) and loss of dignity (78.5%). Five hundred and twenty five people have availed themselves of the DWDA over the 13 years since its enactment: dying from the ingestion of prescribed medication.

Reference:

<http://oregon.gov/DHS/ph/pas/docs/year13.pdf>

Accolades for film on the Oregon Death with Dignity Act

The Oregonian (1) reports that the film ‘How to die in Oregon’ won the Grand Jury Prize in the US documentary competition at the 2011 Sundance Film Festival. The film is an account of the process by which a number of Oregon residents elected to end their lives under the *Dying with Dignity Act*. The Grand Jury Prize is one of the most prestigious non-fiction awards in the world.

Reference:

(1) Shawn Levy, *The Oregonian*, 29 January 2011

UK: No charges laid

The UK Director of Public Prosecutions has not brought charges against at least 20 people who are suspected of aiding a suicide. The Public Prosecutor, Keir Starmer QC, stated that the cases were ‘difficult’ and involved families where loved ones were accused of assisting in suicide. Earlier in 2010 the DPP drew up guidelines around where prosecutions for assisted suicide are likely to be

The VE Bulletin is available by email.

Please consider this option to help reduce postage costs.

Email: info@saves.asn.au to receive future editions by email. Thankyou.

brought. These guidelines suggest that prosecutors do not regard a compassionate response as a crime, despite the 1961 *Suicide Act*, under which assisting a suicide potentially attracts a jail sentence of 14 years. Mr Starmer gave evidence at an inquiry into assisted dying led by Lord Falconer, former Labour Lord Chancellor, and a leading advocate of new right-to-die laws. More than 100 people have travelled to the Dignitas clinic in Zurich to die within the last seven years, with no accompanying relative being prosecuted.

Reference:

(1) Steve Doughty, ‘No charges in 20 assisted-suicide cases as Public Prosecutions charged with re-writing law’, *Daily Mail*, online, Associated Newspapers Ltd. 15th December 2010.

Cancer Council ‘Relay for Life’

SAVES has registered a team in the April 9th – 10th Cancer Council’s ‘Relay for Life’ to support this worthy cause. The Cancer Council’s national fundraising event also provides an opportunity to ‘come together to celebrate cancer survivors, remember loved ones lost to cancer and fight back against a disease that takes too much’. Teams of 10-15 members keep a baton moving relay style in an overnight walk or run from 2pm to 9am. There are no barriers to entry and participants can choose to stay for only an hour or so. Team members are still needed for the SAVES team. Please phone Frances on 0421 305 684, or to make a donation, see the website below or ring the Cancer Council on 8291 4111.

<http://sa.relayforlife.org.au/about-relay/what-is-relay-for-life.html>

Join today!

Membership is FREE. We simply add your name, with all other members, as ‘signatories’ to Group letters going to MPs. We welcome non Christians who support our aims.



Post coupon to
429 Anzac Road, Port Pirie,
South Australia, 5540
or visit our website
www.Christiansforve.org.au

Donations or sponsorship
towards advertising are
welcome.

I WANT THE CHOICE OF A PEACEFUL DEATH!

I wish to join **Christians Supporting Choice for Voluntary Euthanasia** as a ‘signatory’ in their campaign to have Voluntary Euthanasia legalised in Australia as an option for people suffering unbearably from a hopeless or terminal illness. Such legislation would include stringent safeguards against abuse.

Name Mr/Mrs/Ms/Dr/

Address

Email

Signature Date.....

Please send more information [] Denomination (optional).....

OPTION I am not a Christian, but wish to support the Group []

NOTICE OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Of the SA Voluntary Euthanasia Society Inc. (SAVES) at
The Disability Information and Resource Centre (DIRC), 195 Gilles St, Adelaide.

2.15 pm Sunday 3rd April 2011

Business will include the president's and treasurer's reports and election of office bearers and other committee members for a period of one year. Written nominations for official positions, signed by nominating and nominated persons must be received by Friday March 11th 2011.

Come join us and find out about the voluntary euthanasia Bills in the House of Assembly

Bring your friends. All welcome.

Tea/coffee and biscuits will be available at the conclusion of the meeting.

Other public meetings for 2011: 24th July, 23rd October

South Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Society Inc. (SAVES)

Annual Membership Fees: Single \$ 25.00 (concession \$ 10.00) Double \$ 30.00 (concession \$ 15.00)

Life Membership: Single \$ 200.00, Double \$ 300.00

Annual Fees fall due at the end of February. Payment for two years or more reduces handling and costs.

Mr/Mrs/Ms/other Date.....

Address

..... Postcode Telephone

Date of birth (optional) Email address

Your expertise which may be of help to SAVES

Membership fee(s) for..... year(s) \$

Donation \$

Total \$

Office Use	
Database	Treasurer
Changes	Letter

Please indicate method of payment
and send completed form to:

**SAVES Membership Officer,
PO Box 2151, Kent Town SA 5071**

Enclosed cheque or money order

Or pay by Electronic Funds Transfer quoting name and type of payment to:

Commonwealth Bank BSB 065 129 account number 00901742

SAVES members support the Society's primary objective which is a change in the law, so that in appropriate circumstances and with defined safeguards, death may be brought about as an option of last resort in medical practice. These circumstances include the free and informed request of the patient and the free exercise of professional judgement and conscience of the doctor.

SAVES IS NOT ABLE TO HELP PEOPLE END THEIR LIVES

SAVES' Primary Objective:

A change to the law in South Australia so that in appropriate circumstances, and with defined safeguards, death may be brought about as an option of last resort in medical practice. These circumstances include the free and informed request of the patient and the free exercise of professional medical judgment and conscience of the doctor.



Committee:

President

Vice Presidents

Frances Coombe

Julia Anaf

Mary Gallnor

Hon. Secretary

Hon. Treasurer

Administrative Officer

Minutes Secretary

Anne Hirsch

Hamish Claxton

Victoria Pollifrone

Dianne Lake

Patrons

Emeritus Professor J.A. Richardson

Emeritus Professor Graham Nerlich

Emeritus Professor John Willoughby

Telephone

8379 3421

(prefixes: interstate 08, international +61 8)

Internet

www.saves.asn.au

The VE Bulletin is published three times a year by the SA Voluntary Euthanasia Society Inc. (SAVES). Letters, articles and other material for possible publication are welcome and should be sent to The VE Bulletin Editor, SAVES, PO Box 2151, Kent Town SA 5071.

The statements and views expressed by contributors do not necessarily represent SAVES official policy. Material in this publication may be freely reproduced provided it is in context and given appropriate acknowledgement.

Editor: Julia Anaf