Dear Secretary, I'm a Victorian and do not have a direct concern about your Donor Conception Practices. However, there is a campaign in Victoria by those that managed to influence the Victorian Politicians to retrospective change their Donor Anonymity Laws to also influence the Tasmanian Politicians to do likewise.

I'm forwarding you an email that I sent to the director of VARTA shortly after the Victorian legislation was passed. I believe that my views would be supported by 80% of all donors. Unfortunately, anonymous donors rarely if ever get a chance to voice their opinion.

The most prudent thing for Tasmanian politicians to wait and see the outcome of the Victorian Legislation before bringing in retrospective laws.

Kind regards,

John

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: John Monash
To: 
Cc: 
Sent: Monday, 16 May 2016, 21:12
Subject: Law Week presentation

Dear Louise, Re: Law Week 2016: ‘Donor Conception: from Anonymity to Openness’: 19 May 2016

Good luck with your seminar on Thursday evening. It goes to show that with a little luck it only takes a small determined group of less than 1% of the population to influence politicians to bring in retrospective laws. However, VARTA will need plenty of luck and resources implementing the laws that VARTA supported groups successfully fought for.

According to Danish donor statistics, less than 20% of gamete donors want to be identified to their offspring. Since there is no reason why that data should not be applied to Australia, it's possible that 80% of the pre 1998 donor conceived will not be welcomed with open arms by their donors, so VARTA will have some difficult counselling sessions ahead.

It will be difficult because the coercive nature of the new retrospective ART laws will lead to resistance from donors, recipients and DCs. Initially, VARTA may not get too much negative feedback since anonymous donors have been cleverly kept out of the ART debate and most donors will still be totally unaware of the new laws. Even this seminar seeks to exclude anonymous donors by making it compulsory for attendees to give identifying information prior to purchasing a ticket. Why couldn’t attendees pay the small entry fee at the door?
It is 9 months since I first became aware of the campaign for retrospective changes to the 1984 ART Laws and my emotional reactions have changed from being proud to be a donor to now experiencing the emotions of a rape victim. For me, it was bad enough finally realizing that I had been wrongly and repeatedly seduced into becoming a biological part of this ART mess, but our identity is our soul, yet the power for donors, recipients and the donor conceived to control their privacy has now been stolen.

My heritage information, personal details and family photographs have been on the Voluntary Register from 2010 until March 2016. I was cautious about my identity being given out, but remained open to further correspondence and possible contact. (This seemed to satisfy my one and only DC inquirer). Now because of the retrospective ART Laws, my identity will be given out without my consent, so I have removed all material from the Voluntary Register. I have officially stressed that I will have NO CONTACT with anyone regarding my donations, because I don’t want to tell offspring that we have been cheated by the system meaning their conception was under false pretenses.

There should have been a win-win way of dealing with this issue. Maybe at the seminar you will empathically consider all of the stakeholders. Please read the above to your audience, they should know that their Fairy Tales with happy endings will have wicked stepmothers & stepsisters, wolves, witches and poison apples too.

Yours sincerely,
John

PS. Please DNA test the DCs legal father first. The folly of not doing that is a “Rosie Project” theme.