

1998

(No.3)



1998

---

PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

---

## **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

### **REPORT**

**ON**

**THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION ON**

**VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA**

**REPORT NO. 6**

*Report of the Community Development Committee  
House of Assembly*

---

#### MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Hon. J. L. Jackson, MHA Chair  
Hon. D. E. Swan, MHA  
Mrs. D. L. Hollister, MHA

Ms. P. C. Wriedt, MHA  
Mr. M. T. Hidding, MHA

---

## CONTENTS

		PAGE
1.	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	3
2.	<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE</b> .....	4
3.	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	
	Findings of the Committee .....	5
	Recommendations of the Committee .....	7
4.	<b>SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION</b>	
	Conduct of the Inquiry .....	8
	Terminology .....	9
5.	<b>SECTION 2 – OVERVIEW OF THE DEBATE</b>	
	Background .....	12
	Arguments for Voluntary Euthanasia .....	14
	Arguments Against Voluntary Euthanasia .....	15
	Summary.....	19
5.	<b>SECTION 3 – ETHICAL AND MORAL ISSUES</b>	
	Sanctity of Life .....	21
	Self-determination and Autonomy.....	24
	Findings .....	27
	Recommendations .....	28
6	<b>SECTION 4 - LEGAL ISSUES</b>	
	Safe Legislation .....	29
	Existing Practices .....	31
	Common Law Rights .....	34
	End-of-Life Decisions .....	35
	International Law .....	37
	Findings .....	38
7.	<b>SECTION 5 - SOCIAL ISSUES</b>	
	Social Effects of Euthanasia .....	39
	Palliative Care .....	43
	Findings .....	47
	Recommendations .....	47
8.	<b>SECTION 6 –ADVANCE DIRECTIVES AND LEGISLATIVE REFORM</b>	
	Advance Directives .....	48
	Legislative Provisions in Other Jurisdictions .....	51
	Guardian and Administration Act 1995 (Tasmania) .....	52
	Implementation .....	53
	Recommendations .....	54

---

9. **APPENDIX 1 – SUBMISSIONS**
10. **APPENDIX 2 - DOCUMENTS RECEIVED**
11. **APPENDIX 3 – WITNESSES**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Committee extends its appreciation and thanks to all who participated in this inquiry.

In particular the Committee would like to recognise the efforts of the following persons:

Ms Brenda McGivern

(Whom the Committee engaged to provide an analysis of the legislative reform required to facilitate the Committee's recommendations on advance directives as presented in Section 6 of the report)

Ms Amanda Adrian  
Mr. John Blackwood  
Ms Margaret Brown

Dr. Paul Dunne and the  
Staff of the Whittle Ward

Ms Deborah Frith  
Ms Lisa Huber  
Mr. John Lebreton  
Professor Norelle Lickiss  
Dr. Janine Liddle  
Ms Vicki Lindner  
Professor Ray Lowenthal  
Professor Ian Maddox  
Dr. Margaret Otlowski  
Ms Lisa Warner  
Ms Sally Williams

and

The staff of the Committee Secretariat

---

**THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**Inquiry into the Need for Legislation in**

**Tasmania on Voluntary Euthanasia for the Terminally Ill**

---

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

In accordance with its establishing terms of reference, the Community Development Committee resolved to undertake an inquiry into the need for legislation in Tasmania to allow for voluntary euthanasia or assisted suicide for the terminally ill, having regard for:

- (a) social;
  - (b) ethical; and
  - (c) legal implications of such legislation.
-

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In considering the need for legislation allowing active voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide the Committee made the following findings and recommendations:

### FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. The Committee found that whilst many of the moral arguments put by both sides of the debate were persuasive, a determination of the need for legalisation on voluntary euthanasia cannot be made on the basis of a subjective moral choice.
  2. The Committee found that the polarised character of the moral debate for and against voluntary euthanasia limited its utility as a determinant for legal reform. Euthanasia legislation would have to be based on a general principle that treated all individuals equally.
  3. Anecdotal evidence presented to the Committee identified a need for patients' rights to be affirmed. The Committee found that in some cases patients had difficulty ensuring that their wishes would be respected in regard to their medical treatment when they became incompetent.
  4. The Committee found that whilst individual cases may present a strong case for reform the obligation of the state to protect the right to life of all individuals equally could not be delivered by legislation that is based on subjective principles.
  5. The Committee found that there is evidence to suggest that abuses of the current prohibition on active voluntary euthanasia do occur and Tasmania may not be immune to such abuses.
  6. The Committee does not consider the legalisation of voluntary euthanasia as an appropriate solution to abuses that may be occurring in the current system.
  7. The Committee found that the codification of voluntary euthanasia legislation could not adequately provide the necessary safeguards against abuse.
  8. The Committee found that common law rights exist for a competent patient to refuse any medical treatment, including life-sustaining treatment. Likewise legal recognition is given to a competent patient's anticipatory consent in the form of an advance directive or through an advocate in the event of becoming incompetent.
  9. The Committee found that a doctor was not legally culpable for manslaughter or murder if his intent in withholding or withdrawing medical treatment from a patient who subsequently died was to relieve the patient of the burden of futile treatment in accordance with prudent medical treatment. Likewise the administration of sedative and analgesic drugs to terminally ill patients for the
-

relief of pain and suffering even when it is foreseeable that such action will shorten life is not illegal whilst the intent is to provide palliation and not to deliberately kill the patient.

10. The Committee found that the legalisation of voluntary euthanasia would pose a serious threat to the more vulnerable members of society and that the obligation of the state to protect all its members equally outweighs the individual's freedom to choose voluntary euthanasia.
  11. From the evidence presented the Committee found that in the majority of cases palliative care was able to provide optimum care for suffering patients.
  12. The Committee recognises that in a small percentage of cases palliative care is ineffective in relieving all pain, however whilst regrettable this is not sufficient cause to legalise voluntary euthanasia.
  13. The Committee found that there is a need for greater resources to expand and improve the quality of palliative care services.
  14. There was a demonstrated need for increased education on several levels to improve the delivery and efficacy of palliative care.
    - To provide for greater public awareness of the services available and their benefits;
    - To familiarise general practitioners with the availability of specialist palliative care and encourage them to access it for their patients; and
    - To provide greater palliative care training for health care workers in undergraduate and postgraduate settings.
-

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

### Legislation

1. The *Guardianship and Administration Act* 1995 (Tasmania) be amended to include express provisions dealing with the ability to give advance directives relating to medical treatment to an appointed guardian. The model and scope of provisions adopted in Queensland should be used as a guide. These provisions should include:
  - (a) the ability to appoint an alternative enduring guardian, in the case of the first being unable or unwilling to act; and
  - (b) amendments to the witnessing requirements and forms, such that independent witnessing of the appointment and acceptance parts of the appointment instrument (Form 11) is possible.
2. The power of a guardian to request withdrawal of treatment (in addition to the ability, currently under s39, to consent to treatment) pursuant to directives should be clarified.
3. Any legislative provisions should not derogate from, or impose undue limitations upon, a patient's common law rights. In particular:
  - (a) express provisions should be included which preserve the rights of patients under any other law to consent to, or to refuse, treatment; and
  - (b) no provision should be included which allows doctors not to comply with a valid directive on the basis of their own judgement of its soundness or certainty. Rather, the substituted judgement of the enduring guardian should be respected, subject to review by the Guardianship Board in appropriate cases (as is the case under current provisions).
4. Legislative reform should be coupled with a programme to promote the understanding and use of advance directives amongst the general public and the legal and medical professions.
5. Adequate resources should be provided to effect registration and promotion of advance directives

### Monitoring and Evaluation

6. The Committee recommends that patients have greater access to information about their rights regarding medical treatment.
-



7. The Committee recommends that patient's request and wishes are noted and documented in accordance with the 'Dying with Dignity' guidelines, followed by Tasmanian health care workers.
8. Whilst the Committee found the Dying with Dignity Guidelines to be of a high standard, evidence suggests that breaches may occur and thus compliance should be monitored through a system of audit.
9. The Committee recommends the establishment of some form of ongoing monitoring, evaluation and quality assurance of all health services to the terminally ill throughout the state. Resources should be made available to facilitate standardisation and equity in services and distribution. The Office of the Health Complaints Commissioner may be the appropriate vehicle for the administration of this function.

### **Palliative Care**

10. The Committee found palliative care in Tasmania to be of a high standard and effective where it is readily available. The combination of specialist units and the community-based service provide flexibility and efficiency in meeting patients' needs. However distribution of these services across the state is patchy. Greater resources are needed to ensure that high quality palliative care is available to all those who require it at any time of day.
  11. The Committee strongly recommends that the principle be adopted by government that high quality palliative care be made available and accessible to all who may need it and would benefit from it. The provision of palliative care should be demand driven and not limited by available financial resources. The analogy is drawn with childbirth where it is now accepted that all women are entitled to care during childbirth. Similarly the Committee believes there is an inherent obligation to ensure that everyone has the right to appropriate palliative care.
  12. The Committee recommends that resources be made available to fund public education to dispel misconceptions about palliative care and to alert patients to its benefits. In tandem with public education the Committee recommends that programs for doctors be devised to promote the use of specialist palliative care for their patients.
  13. The Committee recommends a greater emphasis on palliative care in the training of health care workers in undergraduate and postgraduate settings.
-

## SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

### CONDUCT OF THE INQUIRY

- 1.0 The Committee initiated this inquiry in response to the level of public debate prompted by the enactment of the Northern Territory's *Rights of the Terminally Ill Act 1995* and the subsequent repealing legislation, the *Euthanasia Laws Act 1996*.
- 1.1 Dr. Richard Herr, of the University of Tasmania conducted the most recent Tasmanian poll of public opinion on the issue of voluntary euthanasia for the Mercury newspaper.<sup>1</sup> The survey asked participants the following question:
- 1.2 “ Would you like to see Tasmania legalise voluntary euthanasia as the Northern Territory has done?”
- 1.3 54% of respondents answered yes, 34% of respondents answered no and 10.8% were undecided.
- 1.4 This result is indicative of national polls conducted over many years that have consistently demonstrated a majority of people in favour of legalising voluntary euthanasia for the terminally ill.
- 1.5 The Committee saw the need to evaluate the merit of this public dissatisfaction with the present position on the practice of euthanasia through a public inquiry.
- 1.6 The Committee placed advertisements in all major newspapers asking for public submissions, to which there was an overwhelming response. A total of 1,162 written submissions were received from organisations and individuals. The submissions came from a broad cross-section of the community, including academics, doctors, nurses, lawyers, religious leaders, terminally ill patients, social organisations, politicians and private individuals.
- 1.7 The Committee held public hearings in all major centres around Tasmania and travelled to Sydney and Adelaide to evaluate legislation and practices adopted in those jurisdictions in relation to palliative care and advance directives. A total of 91 witnesses responded to the opportunity to present evidence before to the Committee.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Mercury, 13 January 1997

---

## TERMINOLOGY

- 1.8 The appropriateness of legalising voluntary euthanasia can only be meaningfully debated if participants share a common definition of the object of the debate.
  - 1.9 The term euthanasia is derived from the Greek words ‘eu’ and ‘thanatos’, which mean a good or gentle death.
  - 1.10 In its contemporary use ‘euthanasia’ has become difficult to define as advocates of opposing philosophies assign broad or narrow definitions to the term as required by their arguments.
  - 1.11 When broadly defined, euthanasia may include both active and passive modes of deliberately hastening the death of a patient as a compassionate response to the patient’s pain and suffering.
  - 1.12 A narrow definition of euthanasia centres on the deliberate killing of the patient through active means; as with passive euthanasia this action is also motivated by compassion for the suffering of the patient.
  - 1.13 In order to facilitate meaningful debate the Committee adopted the following working definitions of the concepts and issues expounded in this report.
  - 1.14 ***Active euthanasia*** involves the intentional causing of death through a direct action such as administering a dose of lethal drugs.
  - 1.15 ***Passive euthanasia*** may involve the withholding or withdrawal of medication and other medical procedures that may prolong life thus allowing the patient to die naturally as a consequence of their disease.
  - 1.16 ***Voluntary euthanasia*** is the intentional causing of death of a competent patient through action or omission in response to a request from the patient in order to end pain and suffering.
  - 1.17 ***Non-voluntary euthanasia*** involves the intentional causing of death of an incompetent patient through action or omission in the patient’s best interest motivated by compassion for the condition of the patient.
  - 1.18 The withholding or withdrawal of futile treatment or the administering of pain relieving drugs in quantities that may shorten life are not illegal or unethical practices when a doctor takes such action on the basis of prudent medical treatment with regard to the patient’s condition.
  - 1.19 Such medical end-of-life decisions appear to share many of the characteristics of euthanasia and produce a similar outcome; thus we may ask where is the moral difference?
-

- 1.20** In his submission to the Committee Dr. John Fleming, Director, Southern Cross Bioethics Institute answers this question by asserting that ‘intent’ is the differentiating moral that delineates medical end-of-life decisions from euthanasia.

What is morally and legally relevant in medical decisions at the end of life is whether in withholding or withdrawing the treatment the physician intends to kill his patient, or whether his non-treatment decision is based on his best clinical judgement that that treatment would either be futile or burdensome disproportionately to benefit.<sup>2</sup>

- 1.21** Thus a doctor withdrawing or withholding treatment is not legally culpable for the death of the patient if the doctor’s intent was palliation of the patient’s suffering. Even when the hastening of death is foreseen, the patient’s death is seen as a natural consequence of his or her disease.
- 1.22** Some proponents of voluntary euthanasia see this distinction as artificial and claim that there is no moral difference between medical end-of-life decisions and euthanasia. It is simply a matter of time; on the one hand active voluntary euthanasia is quick and painless whilst the withholding or withdrawal of treatment has the same effect, but the patient may suffer a painful lingering death.
- 1.23** The legal doctrine of acts and omissions is another important dimension in the determination of what constitutes euthanasia. Under common law an individual is responsible for his or her actions; culpability for failure to act can only apply where an individual has a duty of care. Doctors have a professional responsibility or duty of care for their patients, thus the withholding or withdrawal of treatment may constitute a neglect of duty and invite prosecution under certain circumstances. A moral dilemma may arise in relation to this principle, as it is usually a medical determination that defines the moment at which the doctor’s duty of care ceases and end-of-life decisions may proceed.
- 1.24** The complex inter-relationship between these concepts and the different emphasis that proponents and opponents of euthanasia place on them brings much ambiguity and confusion to the debate.
- 1.25** This was demonstrated in many of the public submissions received and may indicate the need for a comprehensive public education campaign to eliminate misconceptions and to differentiate legitimate medical practices such as palliative care from active euthanasia.

---

<sup>2</sup> Dr. John I. Fleming, Director, Southern Cross Bioethics Institute, submission 311

---

## **SECTION 2 – OVERVIEW OF THE DEBATE**

### **BACKGROUND**

- 2.0** Modern societies through the use of technology have increased life expectancy for the average person by some 25% since the turn of the century. Improvements in nutrition and the eradication of major diseases have ensured that a majority of the population will reach an old age. As a consequence of ageing populations most modern societies have seen increased levels of mortality associated with degenerative diseases such as cardiovascular disease and cancer.
  - 2.1** Modern medical technology is making advances against these diseases and whilst curative treatments may not yet be fully realised the lives of patients can be prolonged for extended periods. Many patients that in the past would have long succumbed to their disease are kept alive through technological intervention such as artificial resuscitation and respiration.
  - 2.2** The use of technology to prolong the life of terminally ill patients does not always coincide with an improvement to the quality of their lives and in the absence of a cure simply delays death.
  - 2.3** Proponents of active voluntary euthanasia have argued that as quality of life is a subjective judgement, competent and informed terminally ill patients should be allowed to make a rational choice between a quick painless death and a painful lingering death.
  - 2.4** A fundamental moral principle of civilised society is the recognition of individual freedom. This principle holds that when the behaviour of an individual does not threaten or harm other members of society or the public good, individual autonomy should be given full expression.
  - 2.5** The dilemma highlighted by the euthanasia debate is that whilst society grants the individual self-determination to the extent that he or she may not be given even lifesaving treatment without consent, the same competent individual is denied the liberty to ask for euthanasia when he or she decides that they no longer wish to live.
  - 2.6** The evidence presented to the Committee in this inquiry is polarised along this divide between those who argue for the ascendancy of individual autonomy and those who argue that a greater good is served if the individual is denied such a choice.
-

## Other Jurisdictions

- 2.7** The legalisation of euthanasia is an issue that has been passionately debated in many jurisdictions besides Australia. The House of Lords, the Canadian Senate, the New York State Legislature and others have in recent years inquired into the possible legalisation of active voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide for the terminally ill. All such inquiries have produced similar findings in favour of maintaining the prohibition on intentional killing.
- 2.8** The Northern Territory Government breached this universal prohibition on intentional killing with the introduction of the now repealed *Rights of the Terminally Ill Act 1995*. This legislation represented the only instance in the world of legally sanctioned active voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide.
- 2.9** Active voluntary euthanasia is practised in the Netherlands but it has not been legalised by statute. Whilst active euthanasia and assisted suicide remain criminal offences, doctors performing active voluntary euthanasia may avoid prosecution by an appeal to the defence of ‘necessity’. This defence arises as a consequence of the perceived irreconcilable obligations that confront a doctor when caring for a terminally ill patient. The doctor is forced to choose between his or her duty to relieve the patient’s suffering and his or her duty to uphold the law.
- 2.10** This is the dilemma that encapsulates the essence of the euthanasia debate.

## Competing Arguments

- 2.11** The euthanasia debate is in the main contended on the basis of moral philosophy. Proponents and opponents of voluntary euthanasia argue the primacy of the fundamental moral principles on which society is based. The resulting moral dichotomy places the sanctity of life in opposition to individual autonomy. The debate however is more complex than a simplistic choice between competing moral principles. The arguments of moral principle are accompanied by issues relating to the practicalities of implementing voluntary euthanasia, including medical and legal ethics, and these are superimposed by public policy questions on the appropriate balance of individual rights against the greater good of society.
- 2.12** In broad terms the euthanasia debate centres on the question whether it can ever be right to deliberately kill a human being with or without their consent, and the moral, legal and social implications of adopting that position.
-

## ARGUMENTS FOR VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA

- 2.13** The proponents of active voluntary euthanasia argue that as an individual has a right to life then logically he or she has the right to give up that right. Furthermore they argue that a compassionate society would acknowledge this in respect to competent terminally ill patients who seek to die and require the assistance of a doctor.
- 2.14** Substantially the pro-euthanasia argument rests on the principles of self-determination, individual autonomy and human dignity.

### Individual autonomy and choice

- 2.15** Respect for life cannot be fully realised without allowing the expression of individual autonomy and choice in how that life is lived. This principle must be extended to the choice of when life may be ended. The protection of the right to life is the base on which society and the legal system are founded. The proponents of voluntary euthanasia uphold this principle. However they contend that a competent terminally ill patient seeking a quick painless death does not represent any harm to others in society and in the absence of such a threat the state does not have the right to subjugate the individual's autonomy.

### Death with dignity

- 2.16** The sanctity of life is not an absolute principle as acknowledged in the case *Airedale NHS Trust v. Bland* considered by the House of Lords. It was decided that doctors could legally withdraw artificial nutrition and hydration from Anthony Bland, a patient in a permanently vegetative state, allowing him to die. Here the sanctity of life principle yielded to the principle of autonomous best interest.
- 2.17** Implicit in this is that the quality of life, and not simply living, is of intrinsic importance. Thus it is argued an individual should be at liberty to decide for him or herself when their quality of life is no longer acceptable. Unrelenting pain may only be of secondary importance for some patients. Patients may seek active voluntary euthanasia on the basis of subjective quality of life issues. The loss of control and independence in the final stages of a terminal illness may for some constitute an intolerable indignity, and given the choice they would avoid it.

### Existing Practice

- 2.18** Proponents of active voluntary euthanasia argue that there is a strong case for legalisation based on the need to regulate the existing practice of euthanasia. This proposition is supported by the work of Kuhse, Singer and Baume, 'End-of-Life Decisions in Australian Medical Practice'.<sup>3</sup> Their study into medical

---

<sup>3</sup> H. Kuhse, P. Singer and P. Baume *Medical Journal of Australia*, 166, 191-196, 1997

---

end-of-life decisions has indicated that 1.8% of all deaths in Australia are the result of active euthanasia. It was submitted to the Committee that in an environment where medical ethics and the law proscribe the practice of euthanasia and yet it occurs with few if any prosecutions there is a real danger of abuse and a risk of the law coming into disrepute. It was argued that the legalisation of active voluntary euthanasia accompanied with strict guidelines would lead to a safer, more ethical system with less risk of involuntary euthanasia.

### **Moral Equivalence**

**2.19** Furthermore it was submitted that the legalisation of active voluntary euthanasia would bring equity to the present system that allows medical end-of-life decisions for some whilst others, by virtue of their circumstances, suffer a lingering death.

### **Public Opinion**

**2.20** The case for the legalisation of voluntary euthanasia is strongly supported by public opinion. National surveys conducted by Newspoll and Morgan over many years have shown a consistent majority of people in support of active voluntary euthanasia. Proponents of euthanasia argue that the state should give effect to the will of the people and legalise voluntary euthanasia.

**2.21** Evidence presented by those opposing active voluntary euthanasia suggests that public polling in relation to this issue is not representative of informed opinion as the yes / no questions put in such surveys do not convey the depth and complexity of the issues. It can also be argued that popularity does not make something morally or ethically correct nor appropriate public policy.

## **ARGUMENTS AGAINST VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA**

**2.22** The opponents of euthanasia submit that there is no circumstance that can justify the deliberate taking of life.

**2.23** This proposition is supported by an appeal to fundamental moral principles such as the sanctity of life and religious beliefs on which ethics, law and social cohesion are predicated and by the 'slippery slope' thesis that identifies the possible negative consequences that would result if active voluntary euthanasia were legalised.

**2.24** The religious significance of the sanctity of life was noted in many submissions. The Anglican Church of Australia in its submission made the following points as the basis of the religious argument against voluntary euthanasia.

- Christians affirm that life comes from and belongs to God. ... Human beings are understood to be stewards of God's creation
-



... Humanity has a duty to care for and nurture creation, not dominating and exploiting it, as we so often have, but preserving and enriching life which is God's gift;

- Nothing exists in isolation from everything else. Christian theology has long affirmed this idea in relation to humanity; This affirmation stands in stark contrast to views which assert a fundamental individualism and a radical autonomy;
- Christian theology recognises that in spite of suffering and indeed through suffering, God can and does accomplish good.<sup>4</sup>

**2.25** The House of Lords Report of the Select Committee on Medical Ethics also noted the importance of the sanctity of life principle:

Belief in the special worth of human life is at the heart of civilised society. It is the fundamental value on which all others are based, and is the foundation of both law and medical practice. The intentional taking of human life is therefore the offence which society condemns most strongly.<sup>5</sup>

**2.26** Dr. Anthony Fisher of the Australian Catholic University in opposing voluntary euthanasia suggested that:

- The sanctity or inviolability of human life is a fundamental principle in law, ethics and social cohesion;
- The so-called right to die is only a right not to be involuntarily or inappropriately treated and a right to such palliative and other care as can reasonably be provided, not a right to be killed by others or assisted by others to commit suicide;
- A genuinely compassionate response to situations of intractable suffering or indignity need not and would not require the killing or assisting in the suicide of a patient;
- The legalisation and practice of voluntary euthanasia in Tasmania would have a corrupting and uncontrollable effect on health professions and the broader community.

He further suggests that:

It might be contended that those who support the 'right' to voluntary euthanasia need not deny the sanctity of life doctrine: they merely leave to each individual to decide when they have ... 'had enough'. But since others are being asked to cooperate in euthanasia they inevitably will ... make their own judgement about whether any particular request should be complied with: no one in the present debate is proposing assisted suicide on demand. And if a judgement is to be made about the reasonableness of a particular request for euthanasia, then any

<sup>4</sup> Anglican Church of Australia, Diocese of Tasmania, submission 949

<sup>5</sup> House of Lords, Report of the Select Committee on Medical Ethics, Vol 1, p. 13 (1994)

person responding positively to such a request must have come to the view that that particular person's life is not inviolable.<sup>6</sup>

- 2.27** Proponents of voluntary euthanasia however point to the fact that the sanctity of life principle is not an absolute principle and exceptions to the rule are permitted in special cases such as self-defence, capital punishment and war.
- 2.28** However the position is not that these are necessarily exceptions to the rule of sanctity of life, they are legal defences given by the State to killing another person. If the defence was not available then the person could be charged with murder just as anybody else could who killed someone with the intent to do so.
- 2.29** Proponents of voluntary euthanasia argue that voluntary euthanasia should also be included in this category. They contend that the request of a competent, terminally ill patient with unrelenting pain to be released from his or her suffering does not compromise the right to life principle but affirms human dignity and autonomy.
- 2.30** This subjective perspective however ignores the fact that individuals are part of a society. Whilst the individual case is compelling and engenders our sympathy, social policy must consider the weak and vulnerable to whom society has an equal duty to protect. To make an exception in an individual case would introduce a corrupting element into the social relations of the community and threaten the safety of all individuals.

### **The Slippery Slope**

- 2.31** The inherent dangers of legalised voluntary euthanasia as identified by its opponents are collectively known as the 'slippery slope' argument which entails the following:
- The acceptance of voluntary euthanasia for the terminally ill would lead to acceptance of voluntary euthanasia for non-terminal conditions;
  - The acceptance of voluntary euthanasia will lead to involuntary euthanasia;
  - The weaker members of society would be made more vulnerable through a diminishing of the value of human life and a subtle pressure would be brought to bear making the 'choice to die' a 'duty to die';
  - Economic burdens both personal and social would encourage the euthanasia option for the weak and vulnerable;
  - Suicide would become more prevalent in society as death is established as a 'quick fix' solution;
  - Medical ethics and trust in doctors would diminish.
- 2.32** The New York State Task Force on Life and the Law noted that if voluntary euthanasia were legalised:

---

<sup>6</sup> Dr. A. Fisher, Australian Catholic University, submission 538

---

[T]he potential for abuse would be profound. This risk does not presume that physicians will act malevolently. On the contrary, this risk is substantial precisely because physicians will act with benevolent motives. Once euthanasia is established as a “therapeutic” alternative, the line between patients competent to consent and those who are not will seem arbitrary to some doctors. To others, it will seem outright discriminatory or unjust to deny a therapy because of the patient’s incapacity to consent.<sup>7</sup>

## **Palliative Care**

**2.33** The opponents of euthanasia also stress the importance and value of palliative care in reducing suffering for terminally ill patients and argue that in most cases this alone would diminish any claim for the legalisation of active euthanasia.

**2.34** Professor Ravenscroft of the University of Newcastle submitted to the Committee that:

In my experience it is far more often existential pain that moves people to consider euthanasia than the physical pain or physical distress. The observations in our service are that physical pain may not necessarily be controlled - in less than 5 per cent of patients we do not achieve complete control, but it can be reduced to manageable levels. But the management of existential distress is far less successful. It requires the skill of different members of a palliative care team and can seldom be done by one person, such as a general practitioner, in the time generally available in a working day. This is something that is not well addressed in the training of medical students and in doctors in the post-graduate situation, and it is something that we need to focus on.<sup>8</sup>

**2.35** In acknowledging that palliative care will not alleviate all pain, it is argued that pain has physical and emotional or spiritual dimensions. The spiritual suffering experienced by the terminally ill patient requires special care to assist the patient in reconciling and resolving their emotional issues. Voluntary euthanasia would eliminate this important step in the dying process and have a negative effect for the patient, family and friends.

**2.36** Effective palliative care requires a multidisciplinary team working together on all aspects of a patient’s pain including emotional and physical dimensions.

**2.37** Developments in pharmaceutical analgesics and pain management techniques are also helping to reduce the number of ‘hard cases’ that previously did not respond to traditional treatment regimes.

---

<sup>7</sup> The New York State Task Force on Life and the Law, ‘When Death is Sought’, 1994, p 133.

<sup>8</sup> Professor Peter Ravenscroft, transcript, 19/6/97, p. 7

---

- 2.38** Evidence was given of the need for greater resources for palliative care including better training of doctors and health workers. Terminally ill patients placed in acute care settings in Tasmania are not always given appropriate palliative care. The lack of palliative care trained doctors means that patients are suffering unnecessarily. It was also put to the Committee that doctors who do not appreciate the full potential of palliative care treatments may be more amenable to requests for voluntary euthanasia from their suffering patients.

### **Common Law Rights**

- 2.39** Despite its focus on general principles, the law does recognise the individual's right to self-determination. All patients have a common law right to refuse unwanted treatment, even life-sustaining treatment, and doctors imposing treatment on a competent patient, in circumstances other than an emergency, without consent are liable to prosecution.
- 2.40** There is also common law recognition of the patient's anticipatory consent in the form of an advance directive, which would be acted upon in a situation where the patient is incompetent.
- 2.41** Several witnesses noted that whilst assisted suicide was illegal, suicide was not. A patient wishing to die is legally at liberty to commit suicide. Suicide does not involve a second person having to decide that someone's life is not worth living and thus does not jeopardise public safety and social cohesion.

### **SUMMARY**

- 2.42** Having outlined the main arguments proposed by those on both sides of the debate it is clear that questions of moral social principles and individual autonomy dominate the debate.
- 2.43** The practical considerations of implementing safe legislation to allow active voluntary euthanasia are also matters of debate. Proponents suggest that the Northern Territory legislation demonstrated the feasibility of safe implementation. Opponents however argue that there is no foolproof way to guarantee free consent has been given, nor can the inherent corrupting effects of voluntary euthanasia be contained.
- 2.44** Furthermore opponents argue that it is ironic for advocates of voluntary euthanasia to campaign for its legalisation on the grounds that it is already a common practice and then suggest that it could be safely regulated to prevent abuse.
- 2.45** Overarching this debate is the necessity to balance the rights of the individual against those of society for the protection of the public good.
-

- 2.46** The Committee heard anecdotal evidence illustrating the desperate plight of many individual cases where prolonged suffering could not be alleviated with palliative care and patients were forced to endure painful lingering deaths. When confronted with such instances of human suffering we feel empathy and compassion for our fellow human beings, but the Committee had to consider whether public policy can be based on individual cases. It can be argued that if the general principle of prohibition against intentional killing is qualified by exceptions for individual cases there is a risk of compromising the safety of all individuals in society, especially those on the margins such as people with disabilities, the aged and vulnerable minorities.
- 2.47** Individuals presently enjoy equality as participants of society with equal protection under the law. If voluntary euthanasia were to be legalised an inequality would arise where one category of individual is deemed to be of less value than another and could therefore be killed.
-

## SECTION 3 – ETHICAL AND MORAL ISSUES

### SANCTITY OF LIFE

- 3.0** The moral dimension of the euthanasia debate centres on the principle of the ‘sanctity of life’, a principle that encompasses the inviolability, inalienability and, intrinsic worth and equality of the human person.
- 3.1** The ‘sanctity of life’ is universally adopted as the paramount social principle, all societies and legal systems are predicated on the sustenance and protection of the right to life. To allow the intentional killing of innocent individuals would prejudice the common good.
- 3.2** The Committee heard evidence from the leaders of the Catholic and Anglican Church and representatives of several other Christian denominations. All stated the belief that is shared with Judaism and Islam, that life is a God-given gift and that the deliberate termination of human life is an offence against its creator.
- 3.3** It was argued that the sanctity of life principle transcends religious boundaries and is not only a theological doctrine but a basic human value and fundamental principle of law:

We have strong feelings that there is an intrinsic value in human life, irrespective of whether it is valuable to the person concerned or indeed to anyone else. Those who adhere to religious faiths which believe in the sanctity of all God’s creation and in particular that human life was created in the image of God himself will have no difficulty with the concept of the intrinsic value of life. But even those without any religious belief think in the same way ... we should not try to analyse the rationality of such feelings. What matters is that, in one form or another, they form part of almost everyone’s intuitive values. No law which ignores them can possibly hope to be acceptable.<sup>9</sup>

- 3.4** A central theological theme expressed by the Anglican Church was the interconnected character of all creation.

Nothing is in isolation from everything else. Christian theology has long affirmed this idea in relation to humanity. ...Once people recognise their relatedness to each other it follows that we can affirm in life and death, our individual existence is part of the life of the cosmos itself. This is a reality, which overrides any preoccupation with individuality. ... In this context there is no

---

<sup>9</sup> Submission 538

---

straightforward individual right to die. Such a right sits uneasily with other basic values and rights which effectively negate it.<sup>10</sup>

**3.5** A further theological argument in opposition to the legalisation of active voluntary euthanasia is the notion of suffering as a cathartic life process that can have a positive outcome.

**3.6** Dr. David Boadle takes up this point in his submission:

From my many interactions with seriously ill people and their families and friends, I strongly believe that the final stages of a person's life are a time of great healing within social networks (be they of family or friends) ... During that time, old memories are exchanged, tears and laughter are shared, and the grieving process is initiated. This is a fundamental part of the human condition, and I believe that the arbitrary decision that a fellow human being's life has no further meaning (and in so doing terminate that life) will rob our society of one of the essential parts of its fabric.<sup>11</sup>

**3.7** Dr. Margaret Otlowski questioned the weight and significance that should be afforded to religious beliefs in the formulation of public policy in a pluralist society and submits that:

Whilst the convictions of believers must obviously be respected, it must be recognised that in a pluralistic and largely secular society, the freedom of conviction of non-believers must also be upheld ... [P]rohibitions on active voluntary euthanasia based purely on religious beliefs should not be applied by the law to those who do not share that belief ... Only if the legal prohibition on active voluntary euthanasia is removed will everybody be able to live according to his or her convictions; those who oppose active voluntary euthanasia could reject it for themselves, and those who are in favour of the practice are not forced to live against their convictions.<sup>12</sup>

**3.8** Senator Dr. Bob Brown in assessing the relationship of the sanctity of life principle with other competing principles notes that:

The sanctity of life is a very important ethical principle, but it is not absolute. Recognised exceptions to the principle already exist. These exceptions arise where the sanctity of life principle conflicts with other important ethical principles which we apply to decisions about how we should live. These other principles include respect for the individual's right to choose how to live his or her own life in accordance with his or her own personal values ... The law strongly protects this right as central to ensuring

---

<sup>10</sup> Submission 949

<sup>11</sup> Dr. David Boadle, submission 1106

<sup>12</sup> Dr. Margaret Otlowski, Senior Lecturer in Law, University of Tasmania, submission 1102

---

respect for the dignity and liberty of the individual. In the medical context, the law already recognises a competent adult patient's right to refuse any kind of medical treatment, even if death will certainly result from this refusal. In this situation the individual's right to self-determination defeats the sanctity of life principle.<sup>13</sup>

- 3.9** Proponents of euthanasia uphold the sanctity of life as a fundamental principle, but recognise that it is not an absolute principle. It is argued that society presently exempts certain categories of deliberate killing, such as self-defence, capital punishment and war, and as active voluntary euthanasia is consensual and no harm is done to others it too belongs in the category of exempt special cases.
- 3.10** Professor Ronald Dworkin as cited in Dr. Otowski's submission suggests that:

[T]his very sacredness of human life is a crucial argument for rather than against euthanasia. The essence of Dworkin's thesis is that in order to respect individual patient's dignity and the intrinsic value of their lives, we must allow individuals freedom of conscience to make mortal decisions for themselves; that ultimate respect for life is shown by respecting individual choice.<sup>14</sup>

- 3.11** Secular moral argument in support of the sanctity of life principle was put to the Committee by reference to international law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The individual's right to life is recognised by international law as an inviolable and inalienable right that cannot be taken arbitrarily without serious social consequences.
- 3.12** Dr. John Fleming submitted to the Committee that:

Australia has committed itself to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights ... and... the recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equality and inalienable rights of all members of the human family. Inalienable human rights are rights of which an individual may not be deprived and of which the individual may not even deprive him or herself ... If fundamental human rights are not inalienable, if citizens are permitted to give up their fundamental human rights then it undermines the ability of the government or the state to protect the fundamental rights of others, especially the weak and the vulnerable.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Senator Dr. Bob Brown, submission 355

<sup>14</sup> Submission 1102

<sup>15</sup> Submission 311

---



## SELF-DETERMINATION AND AUTONOMY

**3.13** Individual self-determination and autonomy is the fundamental moral principle on which the proponents of active voluntary euthanasia rest their case. Individual freedom and self-determination is considered an inherent human right and is recognised in international law. The philosophical underpinning of this proposition is found in the words of John Stuart Mill in his essay 'On Liberty':

The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others ... over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign.<sup>16</sup>

**3.14** It follows from this that a competent terminally ill patient asking for help in ending his or her life should be at liberty to do so whilst no harm is done to others.

**3.15** The Committee received submissions from many strong-minded, well-informed individuals who found it intolerable to have their decision-making capacity curtailed in the profoundly personal matter of how and when one should die.

**3.16** One such submission came from a former nurse who stated:

Whether admitted openly or not, practitioners constantly make decisions in care settings that end lives ... Often without consultation practitioners will decide who will be resuscitated, rehabilitated, given antibiotics or narcotics, and whose life machine will be turned off and at what time.

However as a client rather than a practitioner, opportunities to exercise these judgements for one's self become extremely limited. To do so also requires a fair degree of confidence, knowledge, strength of mind and will, energy, determination and persistence. Even to obtain accurate, honest information is a difficult chore. To initiate and have recorded on one's medical chart 'not for CPR' is a monumental achievement ... With the diagnosis of cancer, or any other condition, we do not become suddenly unable to function, or incapable of exercising considered judgement ... What we need is to be treated as rational human beings, to have free access to accurate information about our conditions, choice in terms of treatment and a full range of death or exit options available to us ... We are the best judges of the quality of life acceptable to us, of the manner we choose to die and the timing of that death.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Cited in *Voluntary Euthanasia, Morality and the Law*, H. Kuhse, P. Singer et al, *Journal of Law and Medicine*, Vol. 3 No. 2, Nov.1995

<sup>17</sup> S. Donaghue, submission 763

---

**3.17** E. Walker writes in support of individual autonomy:

My greatest concern is that I, as a thinking individual, am not allowed to make a personal decision. That upsets me since we are living in a democracy where the rights of the individual are, generally speaking declared to be of some importance.<sup>18</sup>

**3.18** L. Heathorn concurs with this sentiment:

Our decisions about the whole of our lives are of little use or no value if we are not permitted to make the only one that really matters – the decision to die, when and with dignity.<sup>19</sup>

**3.19** There was a great deal of argument presented to the Committee refuting the notion of individualism and autonomy as a justification for legalising euthanasia.

**3.20** Dr. Fisher rebuts these claims by pointing out:

[The] ... problem with a one-sided stress on autonomy is that it is radically asocial even anti-social: all that matters is that people 'get their own way'. But human beings are social creatures and human freedom is always exercised within a web of relationships. In any choice agents must respect others; they must consider the implications of their choices for the lives of particular persons and for the common good. If we want to 'be put out of our misery' someone else must be involved: so someone else's 'autonomy' is unavoidably affected ... Individual autonomy cannot be absolute because individuals need each other in order to realise their goals, and likewise the actions of individuals have an impact on other people close to them and on society as a whole. Individual rights must be limited to the extent that they cause harm to other persons. While disallowing assisted suicide may seem unfair or harsh in an individual circumstance, this is outweighed by the negative impacts that decriminalisation would have on the popular conscience.<sup>20</sup>

**3.21** Dr. Boadle writes in support of this sentiment:

It is all very well for some to speak of lofty notions of autonomy, but as social beings, we are only truly defined as 'self' by our interactions with others, as they define and redefine themselves by their social interactions with us.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> E. Walker, transcript, 19/6/97, p38

<sup>19</sup> L. Heathorn, submission 359

<sup>20</sup> Submission 538

<sup>21</sup> Submission 1106

---

**3.22** The case was put that the chronically ill and frail elderly, terminally ill and disabled people have the same worth and dignity as everyone else and so deserve the equal protection of our laws. Opponents of euthanasia argue that legalised active voluntary euthanasia may serve the interests of capable individuals with a desire to end their life, but it also exposes the weak and vulnerable members of society to any abuse that may arise from the liberal application of this legislation.

**3.23** In this context Dr. Fisher suggests that:

[If personal autonomy or self-determination] entails the right of competent free and informed adults to decide if, when and how they will live and die. It should be noted from the outset that any such claim, if it is warranted, cannot reasonably be restricted to the terminally ill, or even to the physically sick: if autonomy entails a right to die then this must apply to every competent free and informed person, sick or well.

... [F]ar from expanding patient self-determination, legalised euthanasia actually undermines it: in the very name of ‘autonomy’ many people’s real freedom would in fact be narrowed further and their lives – the premise for all autonomy – put at risk ... Instead of multiplying choice for the sick and dying, euthanasia may limit the availability of medical nursing, counselling and other options for those people and become a great ‘cop-out’ for their society.”<sup>22</sup>

**3.24** The argument for euthanasia based on individual autonomy hinges on the premise that it is a matter of individual choice and that such choices are personal and do not impinge on the rights or freedoms of others. This notion ignores the disproportionate power relations in society and the inequality and vulnerability of the marginalised. In his submission Dr. Christopher Newell noted that Australians with disabilities are already disadvantaged, stigmatised and under-valued in our society and that social attitudes not only shape the individual’s wish to live or die but also influence the allocation of resources. He notes that:

The insidious thing about legislation similar to the Northern Territory legislation is that it creates a category of people who are deemed as “better off dead”, sending a powerful message and the creation of social policy and structures which affirm that.<sup>23</sup>

**3.25** Tasmanians with Disabilities Inc. illustrated this point in its submission noting the difficulties faced by people with disabilities to even make submissions to the Committee and have their views heard.

---

<sup>22</sup> Submission 538

<sup>23</sup> Dr. Christopher Newell, Senior Lecturer, Division of Community and Rural Health, University of Tasmania, submission 1101

---

It is important that the Parliament recognise that people with disabilities are some of the most disadvantaged citizens, and some of the most marginalised in this nation ... We have deep concern that the measures put in place associated with submissions and public hearings on the inquiry will not provide for the access needs of Tasmanians with a diversity of disabilities, let alone those who require interpreters, or indeed those who can only address this highly stressful and emotional issue while supported by resource workers.”<sup>24</sup>

- 3.26** The impact of individual choice and autonomy on the rights and liberties of others in society was also noted in the House of Lords report:

[D]ying is not only a personal or individual affair. The death of a person affects the lives of others, often in ways and to an extent which cannot be foreseen. We believe that the issue of euthanasia is one in which the interest of the individual cannot be separated from the interest of society as a whole.<sup>25</sup>

- 3.27** Dr. Newell questions the appropriateness of the use of terms such as ‘human rights’ and ‘human dignity’ in support of voluntary euthanasia. He views this juxtaposition as antithetic and irreconcilable.

[T]he debate with regard to medical killing revolves around contested notions of ‘rights’, ‘human rights’ and ‘human dignity’. Yet the use of human rights approach, upon which values rest many of our community oriented moral and legal norms, stresses the inalienable dignity of people. Medical killing violates that notion of inalienable dignity rather than enabling it. The different interpretations of ‘autonomy’ is of course the reason for such differing opinions in this debate. Further, this is clearly an issue for people in community, rather than just an issue of individuals doing what they want.<sup>26</sup>

## FINDINGS

- 3.28** The Committee found that whilst many of the moral arguments put by both sides of the debate were persuasive, a determination of the need for legalisation on voluntary euthanasia cannot be made on the basis of a subjective moral choice.
- 3.29** The Committee found that the polarised character of the moral debate for and against voluntary euthanasia limited its utility as a determinant for legal reform. Euthanasia legislation would have to be based on a general principle that treated all individuals equally.

---

<sup>24</sup> Tasmanians with Disabilities Inc., submission 381

<sup>25</sup> House of Lords op cit, p.48

<sup>26</sup> Submission 1101

---

- 3.30** Anecdotal evidence presented to the Committee identified a need for patients' rights to be affirmed. The Committee found that in some cases patients had difficulty ensuring that their wishes would be respected in regard to their medical treatment when they became incompetent.
- 3.31** The Committee found that whilst individual cases may present a strong case for reform the obligation of the state to protect the right to life of all individuals equally could not be delivered by legislation that is based on subjective principles.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.32** The Committee recommends that patients have greater access to information about their rights regarding medical treatment.
- 3.32** The Committee recommends that patient's request and wishes are noted and documented in accordance with the 'Dying with Dignity' guidelines, followed by Tasmanian health care workers.

## SECTION 4 - LEGAL ISSUES

- 4.0** Legal issues raised in relation to the legalisation of active voluntary euthanasia include:
- The problems associated with codifying voluntary euthanasia legislation.
  - The incongruity between current practices and the law.
  - The common law rights of patients to consensual treatment and the right to refuse treatment.
  - The issues surrounding end-of-life decisions and the doctrine of acts and omissions and double effect.
  - The restraints of international law.

### SAFE LEGISLATION

- 4.1** Proponents of legalised active voluntary euthanasia have suggested that it is not beyond reason to envisage legislation that would ensure safe, informed and consensual application. The Northern Territory legislation is cited as an example of what is possible. It provided safeguards to ensure that a patient's request for euthanasia was entirely voluntary and informed and that the patient was mentally competent to make such a decision. Opponents of voluntary euthanasia however submit that it is simply not possible to anticipate all the circumstances involved and to define them in legislation.
- 4.2** The Committee heard evidence from Dr. Brian Pollard who identified three main areas of concern where euthanasia legislation would be subject to abuse: the provision of equal justice; patient autonomy; and free consent.

[T]he evidence is now abundant ... three substantial committees ... have investigated the consequences and the difficulties of legalising euthanasia and every committee of inquiry that has taken a broad approach has come to the same conclusion that safe law would not be possible in this area ...

Pain and suffering are subjective phenomena ...they cannot be quantified, and they cannot be measured and compared. They are not the kinds of things about which objective criteria can be made so that you can set out standards for their investigation ... So the patient's subjective description of what is going on is met by another person's subjective response and neither of them would be capable of being investigated by a euthanasia law so at once

---

you have a great big area of subjectivity and subjectivity or arbitrariness are matters of opinion not able to be subject to the equal application of justice.<sup>27</sup>

- 4.3** Dr. Pollard goes on to question the motivation of doctors participating in voluntary euthanasia and whether it is possible to legislate for *bona fide* motives.

[A]lthough euthanasia is presented as being a matter of personal autonomy, there is always another party ... Euthanasia is actually more critically dependent upon the autonomy of the doctor or other person who makes the final decision whether or not to agree to the request ... We do not know the circumstances under which doctors carry out euthanasia illegally, as they do at present in Australia ... the presumption must be that at least sometimes it was simply on account of the fact that the doctor did not know what else to do.<sup>28</sup>

- 4.4** Dr. Pollard also noted that euthanasia law could not guarantee the patient had given informed consent.

[I]t would be next to impossible to guarantee that anybody's request for euthanasia was in fact freely made. Coercion can be so subtle it can even be unintended. A form of coercion that is not really intended and not very often paid attention to is the coercion that resides in the enormity of the difference in power between a doctor and a patient ... So the inevitable consequence would be that the lives of people would be at risk. People who did not want to die or people whose request had been coerced ... There would be no certainty that a patient's request was the result of having received the proper information on which a good judgement could be made.<sup>29</sup>

- 4.5** The difficulty of formulating workable euthanasia legislation was a theme taken up in Dr. Brendan Nelson's submission.

I ... feel that there are some exceptional circumstances in which it might not be an unreasonable course for a doctor to assist a person to die but I find it impossible to define them ... It is very difficult, if not impossible, to get even a set of principles, a code of ethics and certainly not a piece of legislation that will cover all the situations in which we inevitably find ourselves ... I have found that the law is a blunt instrument; it does not have the finesse to deal with issues in relation to decision-making that doctors and nurses and family members make with a person who is dying. It is not always possible that all of the problems that we face in life are going to be solved by statutes ... Those who think

---

<sup>27</sup> Dr. Brian Pollard, transcript, 22/7/97 p.38

<sup>28</sup> Dr. Pollard, transcript, 22/7/97 p. 39

<sup>29</sup> Dr. Pollard, transcript, 22/7/97 p.39

---

that all human pain and suffering will be resolved by sanctioning euthanasia I feel are sadly misguided.<sup>30</sup>

- 4.6** A related argument posited by those opposing the legalisation of voluntary euthanasia is the notion of the ‘slippery slope’. It is contended that the inability to provide adequate safeguards in the codification of such legislation will inevitably lead to corruption and abuse.
- 4.7** The Tasmanian Branch of the Australian Medical Association directed the Committee’s attention to the findings of the House of Lords report to highlight this problem. The association’s submission quotes:

We do not think it is possible to set safe limits on voluntary euthanasia ...We took account of the present situation in the Netherlands; indeed some of us visited that country and talked to doctors, lawyers and others. We returned feeling uncomfortable, especially in the light of evidence indicating that non-voluntary euthanasia ... was commonly performed ...

We concluded that, if legalised, it would be virtually impossible to ensure that all acts of euthanasia were truly voluntary and hence that any liberalization of the law in the UK could not be abused.<sup>31</sup>

- 4.8** Dr. Otlowski rebutted these arguments asserting that the claim that euthanasia legislation is unsafe fails to address the risks associated with the current legal position where euthanasia occurs in a hidden and unregulated manner.

## EXISTING PRACTICE

- 4.9** In evidence presented to the Committee Dr Otlowski argued that there is an incongruity between current medical practices and the response of the legal system. Dr. Otlowski submits that whilst euthanasia remains illegal its practice remains covert and unregulated thus placing patients in danger of abuse and the law in disrepute.

Despite the strict legal prohibition of the practice, with the threat of the most serious criminal liability (i.e. for murder) the reality of the matter is that not infrequently, requests for active voluntary euthanasia are made by patients, and a significant proportion of doctors are responding to such requests.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Dr. Brendan Nelson MHR, transcript, 22/7/97 p.22

<sup>31</sup> The Tasmanian Branch of The Australian Medical Association, submission 146

<sup>32</sup> Submission 1102

---



- 4.10** The level of active euthanasia practised by Australian doctors was highlighted in the recent study by Kuhse, Singer and Baume, 'End-of-Life Decisions in Australian Medical Practice'.<sup>33</sup>

With regard to doctor's practices, these studies indicate that in excess of one quarter of doctors have performed active voluntary euthanasia ... The recent [Kuhse et al] study tried to provide an estimate of the incidence of euthanasia as a percentage of all deaths in Australia. (Euthanasia there defined as the administration of drugs with the explicit intention of ending the patient's life at the patient's request.) According to this study, it is estimated that 1.8% of all Australian deaths are the result of euthanasia of which .1% comprise cases of physician-assisted suicide.<sup>34</sup>

- 4.11** Several witnesses refuted these findings. The Caroline Chisholm Centre for Health Ethics questioned the definition of euthanasia used in the study and claimed that ambiguous and misleading conclusions were drawn.

The adoption of consequential logic renders the recent euthanasia survey misleading. A doctor who withholds or withdraws burdensome or futile treatment from a terminally ill patient knowingly allows the natural dying process to proceed unimpeded. Although death comes sooner it is neither caused nor necessarily intended by the doctor. The administration of drugs to alleviate pain is justifiable even if the doctor foresees this may hasten death ... It is misleading to label such justifiable medical omissions and actions as medical "end-of-life decisions" or euthanasia. A failure to distinguish between foreseeing the outcomes of medical actions and omissions and intending to cause the same outcomes fatally flaws the survey's conclusion.<sup>35</sup>

- 4.12** Whilst the extent of active voluntary euthanasia may be contested there is sufficient evidence including anecdotal accounts given by witnesses to the Committee to suggest that it is a current practice.
- 4.13** This becomes problematic when in theory the medical profession and the legal system both reject active voluntary euthanasia and doctor assisted suicide as acceptable practices, yet these practices occur.
- 4.14** Dr. Otlowski suggests the legalisation of active voluntary euthanasia is vital if it is to be regulated and controlled to ensure the safety of patients and prevent the law from falling into disrepute.

---

<sup>33</sup> H. Kuhse et al, Medical Journal of Australia 191, 166 (1997)

<sup>34</sup> Submission 1102

<sup>35</sup> Caroline Chisholm Centre for Health Ethics, submission 1098

---

The illegality of assisted suicide and voluntary euthanasia may be the reason why there are a significant number of cases of euthanasia without patient consent thus violating the patient's rights and self-determination.<sup>36</sup>

- 4.15** Another related issue identified by Dr. Otlowski as problematic is the fact that the law establishes culpability for murder only on the basis of intent. Mitigating circumstances such as the motive of compassion and the terminal condition of the patient are not relevant. In practice however few cases of assisted suicide or active euthanasia have attracted sentences for murder.

The gap between the law in theory and the law in practice creates enormous problems. Although questions of motive are strictly speaking irrelevant for the purposes of establishing criminal liability, in practice they will often be decisive in determining the outcome of cases of active euthanasia and doctor-assisted suicide.<sup>37</sup>

- 4.16** The House of Lords report noted that in 22 cases of mercy killing between 1982 and 1991 proceedings were begun on a charge of murder, but in only one case was a conviction for murder recorded. The other cases were reduced to lesser offences and most sentences were either probation or suspended imprisonment.

These statistics suggest two possible conclusions: on the one hand it might appear that existing provisions are sufficiently flexible to allow appropriate outcomes to be achieved; on the other hand it might be suggested that the inadequacy of existing provisions is shown by the way in which the courts and prosecuting authorities apply them.<sup>38</sup>

- 4.17** It is recognised that this outcome may be influenced by the mandatory life sentences which apply in the United Kingdom in such cases. In Tasmania judicial discretion in sentencing has been extended to capital crimes.

- 4.18** The Caroline Chisholm Centre for Health Ethics in acknowledging the dilemma of inconsistency between the practice and letter of the law suggested that:

Euthanasia does not warrant the social approval inherent in its legalisation. Rather than legalise euthanasia for a few hard cases it is better to tolerate the present untidy situation ...<sup>39</sup>

- 4.19** Senator Abetz found the claim that existing practice justifies a change in the prohibition of intentional killing illogical:

---

<sup>36</sup> Submission 1102

<sup>37</sup> Submission 1102

<sup>38</sup> House of Lords op cit p30

<sup>39</sup> Submission 1098

---

This argument is logically weak. Whether euthanasia is a “common practice” is widely disputed. Even if it were it would not of itself provide a justification. Indeed, if it is widely practised, although it is against the law, it highlights the real concerns of many opponents of euthanasia who argue that the illegal excesses of a minority of doctors will simply become commensurately worse with pro-euthanasia legislation.<sup>40</sup>

## COMMON LAW RIGHTS

- 4.20 The central plank of the pro-voluntary euthanasia case is the right of the individual to self-determination and autonomy, especially in relation to his or her body. This right is recognised in common law which denies interference from others without consent.

Central to this right to bodily integrity is the common law doctrine of consent. Strictly speaking, every unauthorised touching of a person constitutes an assault and battery and it is only the fact of consent which renders it lawful.<sup>41</sup>

- 4.21 The requirement for a doctor to receive the informed consent of a patient prior to any medical intervention gives rise to the corresponding right to refuse treatment. Judgements in several common law jurisdictions have confirmed these rights. Notably the judgement in the English case of *Re T (Adult: Refusal of Treatment)*:

An adult patient who ... suffers no mental incapacity has an absolute right to choose whether to consent to medical treatment, to refuse it or to choose one rather than another of the treatments being offered. ... This right of choice is not limited to decisions others might regard as sensible. It exists notwithstanding that the reasons for making the choice are rational, irrational, unknown or even non-existent. The law requires that an adult who is mentally and physically capable of exercising a choice must consent if medical treatment of him is to be lawful, although the consent need not be in writing and may sometimes be inferred from the patient's conduct in the context of the surrounding circumstances. Treating him without his consent or despite a refusal of consent will constitute a civil wrong of trespass to the person and may constitute a crime.<sup>42</sup>

- 4.22 The common law right for competent patients may be extended to situations where the patient is incompetent through the use of an advance directive that gives anticipatory consent.

---

<sup>40</sup> Senator Eric Abetz, submission 5

<sup>41</sup> Margaret Otlowksi, *Voluntary Euthanasia and the Common Law*, Oxford University Press 1997 p.35

<sup>42</sup> Margaret Otlowksi, op cit, p. 38

---

- 4.23** Common law recognition of advance directives was affirmed in the *Re T (Adult: Refusal of Treatment)* case.

The judges in the Court of Appeal made it clear that they considered an anticipatory refusal of treatment to be binding, providing it fulfilled certain conditions. They were that the person concerned was competent, had contemplated the situation which later arose appreciated the consequences of refusing treatment and was not unduly influenced by another.<sup>43</sup>

- 4.24** The Canadian case of *Malette v Shulman* further strengthens this claim. The patient involved in this case had sustained serious injuries requiring a blood transfusion, however as a Jehovah's Witness her beliefs prohibited such a procedure and in anticipation of being treated whilst unconscious she carried an advance directive instructing that no blood products should be administered. This directive was ignored by her doctors leading her to sue for damages. The court found in her favour and said that:

A doctor is not free to disregard a patient's advance instructions any more than he would be free to disregard instructions given at the time of the emergency. The law does not prohibit a patient from withholding consent to emergency medical treatment, nor does the law prohibit a doctor from following his patient's instructions. While the law may disregard the absence of consent in limited emergency circumstances, it otherwise supports the right of competent adults to make decisions concerning their own health care by imposing civil liability on those who perform medical treatment without consent.<sup>44</sup>

- 4.25** In recent years several jurisdictions have moved to confirm these common law rights in statute. The Committee believes that such an affirmation of the individual's common law rights will give reassurance to patients and control in the determination of their treatment.

## **END-OF-LIFE DECISIONS**

- 4.26** The legal doctrine of acts and omissions helps to distinguish between killing and letting die. An ethical debate arises in the context of whether there is a moral difference between intending to hasten death and foreseeing that a patient's life will be shortened. In discussing the legal duty of the medical profession Margaret Otlowksi notes that:

---

<sup>43</sup> House of Lords op cit, p.39

<sup>44</sup> Mr. John Blackwood, President Guardianship and Administration Board, 'The Status and Legality of Advance Directives in Australia', document No.

---

It is generally accepted that a doctor's duty to his or her patient is not absolute. The law does not require that all possible treatments and procedures be used in every case. The patient's prognosis may be so poor that the continuation is futile, and the artificial prolongation of the dying process may in fact be seen as being contrary to the patient's best interests. In such circumstances, where the patient is unlikely to benefit from further treatment, a doctor would not be under a legal duty to provide that treatment.<sup>45</sup>

- 4.27** Proponents of active voluntary euthanasia have charged that active and passive euthanasia is morally equivalent. However it is recognised in common law that in the absence of intent to kill and when acting in accordance with prudent medical practice a doctor withdrawing or withholding treatment is not legally culpable for the subsequent death of the patient. The patient is simply allowed to die from his or her disease. The prolonging of treatment that will not benefit the patient or that is burdensome is deemed to be against the best interest of the patient.

... [there is a] long established view that there are strong intuitive moral and clinical distinctions between stopping futile treatment and giving a lethal injection. To try to equate the two is disingenuous. As is the blurring of the concepts of not prolonging the life of, and killing, a patient.<sup>46</sup>

- 4.28** The concept of acts and omissions was central to the decision taken in the *Bland* case where the removal of artificial nutrition and hydration from the patient in a vegetative condition was deemed to be an omission which was not intended to hasten death but rather a refusal to persist with futile treatment in the best interest of the patient.

- 4.29** The administration of treatment that will relieve symptoms of illness but may hasten death is known as the double effect principle. Again the matter of intent is the crucial factor in determining the ethical justification of certain treatments which usually involve the use of opiate and sedative drugs to relieve cancer pain.

The obligation to relieve pain is so overriding that, where medically indicated, analgesics should be administered even if they may shorten life, so long as this is not the intended purpose ... The administering of pain killing through life-shortening drugs to terminally ill patients is rendered lawful if the doctor is acting in the best interests of the patient, despite the fact that the patient will die as a consequence.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Margaret Otlowski, op cit, p. 33

<sup>46</sup> Submission 5

<sup>47</sup> House of Lords op cit p.20

---

## INTERNATIONAL LAW

- 4.30** A number of submissions to this inquiry made the point that the legalisation of active voluntary euthanasia would violate numerous international treaties and covenants to which Australia is a signatory. These include the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* and the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, quoted by Dr. John Fleming in his submission:

The foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world is the recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family.<sup>48</sup>

- 4.31** The recognition of this principle is manifest in the international codes of practice governing medical practice.
- 4.32** The Tasmania Branch of the Australian Medical Association and the Federation of Nurses adhere to the precepts of international codes of practice such as the World Medical Association.
- 4.33** The World Medical Association Statement on Physician Assisted Suicide, 1992 states:

Physician-assisted suicide like euthanasia is unethical and must be condemned by the medical profession. Where the assistance of the physician is intentionally and deliberately directed at enabling the individual to end his or her own life, the physician acts unethically. However the right to decline medical treatment is a basic right of the patient and the physician does not act unethically even if respecting such a wish results in the death of the patient.<sup>49</sup>

- 4.34** Archbishop Eric D’Arcy notes in his submission that international law recognises the inherent dignity of human life as unconditional. He states that:

International instruments confirm this principle as foundational to international law. By it we understand the international community to say that human beings cannot be divested, or divest themselves, of their inherent dignity for any reason; it is inalienable. Age, or disability, do not derogate from a person’s dignity. A principal object of law, international or domestic, is to protect the most vulnerable in the community ... If the precept of universal protection is not foundational to the legal system as society generally, certain categories of persons, such as the terminally ill, will find themselves relegated to a condition entitled to less than the utmost protection of the law.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Submission 311

<sup>49</sup> Submission 146

<sup>50</sup> Dr. Eric D’Arcy, Archbishop of Hobart, submission

## **FINDINGS**

- 4.35** The Committee found that there is evidence to suggest that abuses of the current prohibition on active voluntary euthanasia do occur and Tasmania may not be immune to such abuses.
- 4.36** The Committee does not consider the legalisation of voluntary euthanasia as an appropriate solution to abuses that may be occurring in the current system.
- 4.37** The Committee found that the codification of voluntary euthanasia legislation could not adequately provide the necessary safeguards against abuse.
- 4.38** The Committee found that common law rights exist for a competent patient to refuse any medical treatment, including life-sustaining treatment. Likewise legal recognition is given to a competent patient's anticipatory consent in the form of an advance directive or through an advocate in the event of becoming incompetent.
- 4.39** The Committee found that a doctor was not legally culpable for manslaughter or murder if his intent in withholding or withdrawing medical treatment from a patient who subsequently died was to relieve the patient of the burden of futile treatment in accordance with prudent medical treatment. Likewise the administration of sedative and analgesic drugs to terminally ill patients for the relief of pain and suffering even when it is foreseeable that such action will shorten life is not illegal whilst the intent is to provide palliation and not to deliberately kill the patient.
-

## SECTION 5 – SOCIAL ISSUES

### SOCIAL ISSUES

- 5.0** The social impact of legalised voluntary euthanasia was predominantly presented in negative terms. Voluntary euthanasia was presented in many submissions as a corrupting influence that would undermine social values and initiate a ‘slide’ from voluntary to non-voluntary euthanasia. On a philosophical level the subjective status of voluntary euthanasia was challenged with the assertion that the death of an individual affects all in society.

Society itself is affected by euthanasia legislation. It devalues all of us as human beings both by its introduction and its acceptance.<sup>51</sup>

There will always be differences of opinion on profound matters in a free society, but being put to death with one’s consent is not a private matter, for it strikes at the foundations of what we are, and affects not only the one put to death, but the one who carries it out. Our acts shape us, and the act of putting another person to death must change us. If we are doctors, it strikes at the core of what we should be in society: bringers of life, of hope, of healing, of comfort ... but not bringers of death.<sup>52</sup>

### Slippery Slope Arguments

- 5.1** It was argued that legalised voluntary euthanasia would erode the trust between doctors and patient, it would lead to less investment in community health services and palliative care, and it would negate the effort being made to reduce suicide. The most vulnerable members of society, the seriously ill, those with disabilities, the aged and minority groups would be made to feel that they were a burden and had a duty to die.
- 5.2** The Caroline Chisholm Centre for Bioethics submission envisaged that the legalisation of voluntary euthanasia would seriously impact on society:

... It would undermine the respect due to human life in the community as a whole. It would enable subtle and unspoken pressure to be exerted on the sick and elderly to choose death at the hand of doctors as a convenience for themselves, and others or for saving costs. The legalising of the right to choose to be

---

<sup>51</sup> Submission 1098

<sup>52</sup> Submission 146

---



painlessly killed generates an invasive obligation for all the dying to choose one way or the other, e.g. those who feel they are a burden to society may feel a duty or pressure to request euthanasia.<sup>53</sup>

- 5.3** The British Medical Association submission to the House of Lords inquiry also noted the corrupting effect of voluntary euthanasia and suggested that:

... By removing the barriers to the previously ‘unthinkable’ and permitting people to be killed, society would open up new possibilities of action ... Any moral stance founded on the permissibility of active termination of life in some circumstances may lead to a climate of opinion where euthanasia becomes not just permissible but desirable. Once active termination of life is a matter of choice for competent people, the grounds for excluding non-competent people from such treatment become harder to defend.<sup>54</sup>

- 5.4** Professor Ravenscroft also made the point that, once legalised, voluntary euthanasia could not be contained and would place the wider community at risk:

Why restrict euthanasia to patients with pain, suffering and distress? Why should healthy people, who find life no longer tolerable, not have the right to die and ask medical practitioners to assist with it? This is certainly the case with youth suicide, which is a major problem in our society. How will we contain the logical progression of this legislation into wide-spread accommodation of euthanasia? What message will we be conveying to people in this country who are attempting suicide at record rates?<sup>55</sup>

- 5.5** The proponents of voluntary euthanasia dismiss the claims of corruption and ‘slippery slopes’ as ‘scaremongering’ that cannot be substantiated.

- 5.6** Senator Bob Brown suggested that there is no evidence to believe that changing the law will increase the incidence of non-voluntary euthanasia.

There is however evidence, that the current legal prohibition in Australia on active voluntary euthanasia does not effectively prevent doctors from practising active voluntary euthanasia. The only empirical research on end-of-life medical decisions that has been conducted in Australia indicates that 1.8% of deaths in this country are the result of active voluntary euthanasia. The same research suggests that Australian medical practice has to some extent already “slid down the slippery slope” despite the current

---

<sup>53</sup> Submission 1098

<sup>54</sup> House of Lords op cit p. 26

<sup>55</sup> Transcript, Ravenscroft 19/6/97 p.10

legal prohibition on doctors killing their patients. The research indicates that 3.5% of deaths in this country involve a doctor administering drugs with the explicit intention of ending the patient's life, without a concurrent explicit request by the patient. ... Empirical research from the Netherlands [where euthanasia has a quasi legal status] indicates that only 0.7% of deaths in that country involve the ending of life without the patient's explicit request.<sup>56</sup>

- 5.7** The Hobart Community Legal Service also questioned the validity of the 'slippery slope' argument and submitted that the legalisation of voluntary euthanasia would improve the existing situation rather than undermine it.

... Involuntary euthanasia already exists. Legislation for voluntary euthanasia has the capacity to ensure that such a trend is not the case: that sufficient safeguards and provisions are put in place to reduce any inappropriate resort to involuntary euthanasia. This may act to curtail some autonomous medical decision-making in the absence of the person's explicit consent.<sup>57</sup>

- 5.8** As noted elsewhere in this report the pro-euthanasia argument rests predominantly on the notion of autonomy and the quality of life.
- 5.9** The proponents of active voluntary euthanasia argue that the subjective needs of those suffering pain and distress at the final stages of a terminal illness should be the primary determinant for allowing voluntary euthanasia. They suggest that the diminishing quality of life experienced under such circumstances is sufficient justification for an individual to choose euthanasia.
- 5.10** Those opposing the legalisation of euthanasia argue that far from being a subjective act, voluntary euthanasia affects all of society.
- 5.11** The tension between the rights of the individual and the broader interest of society are noted by Professor Lowenthal. He suggests that:

Lawmakers and the medical profession share a common goal of the protecting the weak and vulnerable. If active voluntary euthanasia were legalised, the frail, the very elderly and the severely handicapped would be at great risk ... The community recognises the importance of personal autonomy and rightly only restricts it by law when this is required by policy for the common good (eg speed limits), to protect the autonomy of others or to protect the individual from harm ... The duty to protect human life from direct lethal assault requires limits to autonomy and freedom to forbid the intentional killing of persons.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Submission 355

<sup>57</sup> Hobart Community Legal Service, submission 1090

<sup>58</sup> Submission 146

---

- 5.12** Senator Abetz drew the Committee's attention to the shortcomings of the assertion that the quality of individual's life should be the determinant for allowing voluntary euthanasia.

The dignity or otherwise of death is not to be determined by the physical circumstances or degree of pain in which the patient finds themselves ... A disturbing equation is ... drawn between having "dignity" and being "without dignity". The term has been used as though there is a loss of dignity if somebody who was previously without disability takes on a disability in the course of a terminal illness.

Whilst it is those concerned about the impact on people with disabilities who have highlighted this issue it needs to be noted that the impact is even broader. Any notion that those who choose the path of natural death or those who choose to live with disabilities are in some way taking the less dignified path should be abhorrent to any caring society. The attitude ... that dying with dignity demands that life ends before such circumstances begin carries a message which only serves to devalue those who live in such circumstances.<sup>59</sup>

- 5.13** In an environment where human value is measured by utility the weak and vulnerable would be seriously disadvantaged. This position was put by Dr. Hassed:

If we value people because of their utility it is not too hard to see that people soon feel that they have a duty to die when they are no longer valuable. Being in an unfortunate situation only appears undignified, but neglecting the intrinsic worth of our fellow human beings is undignified.<sup>60</sup>

- 5.14** The need to uphold the interests of society and curtail the actions of individuals that would compromise the 'greater good' was also recognised in the report of The House of Lords Select Committee on Medical Ethics.

Ultimately, however, we do not believe that these arguments are sufficient to weaken society's prohibition on intentional killing. That prohibition is the cornerstone of law and social relationships. It protects each one of us impartially, embodying the belief that all are equal. We do not wish that protection to be diminished and we therefore recommend that there should be no change in the law to permit euthanasia. We acknowledge that there are individual cases in which euthanasia may be seen by some to be appropriate. But individual cases cannot reasonably establish the foundation of a policy, which would have such serious and widespread repercussions. ... We believe that the

---

<sup>59</sup> Submission 5

<sup>60</sup> Submission 358

---

issue of euthanasia is one in which the interest of the individual cannot be separated from the interest of society as a whole.<sup>61</sup>

- 5.15** Society's interest in the protection of human life and the maintenance of collective security outweighs the rights of the individual to take autonomous action that would harm society.

A positive choice has to be made by society in favour of protecting the interests of its vulnerable members even if this means limiting the freedom of others to determine their end.<sup>62</sup>

- 5.16** It is in this social context that the Committee supports the provision of quality palliative care for the terminally ill.

## **PALLIATIVE CARE**

- 5.17** The Committee heard a great deal of evidence on the management of the terminally ill through palliative care services. Generally it was submitted that palliative care was successful in greatly reducing the suffering of terminally ill patients in the majority of cases and ensuring a peaceful and comfortable death.

- 5.18** The Australian and New Zealand Society of Palliative Medicine defines palliative care as:

the study and management of patients with active, progressive, far advanced disease for whom the prognosis is limited and the focus of care is in the quality of life ... Palliative care is the active total care of patients whose disease is not responding to curative treatment. Control of pain, of other symptoms, and psychological, social and spiritual problems is paramount. The goal of palliative care is the achievement of the best quality of life for patients and their families. Palliative care affirms life and regards dying as a normal process ... Palliative care has always operated on the premise ... that it neither hastens nor postpones death.<sup>63</sup>

- 5.19** Professor Peter Ravenscroft argues that a significant component of the suffering experienced by dying patients is existential mental suffering that requires a multidisciplinary approach to treatment. Professor Ravenscroft submitted that there is a prevalence of major depression in up to 30 % of patients admitted to palliative care. He further suggests that in many cases requests for euthanasia are largely a consequence of untreated depression.

In my experience it is far more often that the existential pain moves people to consider euthanasia than the physical pain or

---

<sup>61</sup> House of Lords Report, op cit p. 48

<sup>62</sup> House of Lords Report cited in Right to Life, submission 383

<sup>63</sup> S. Boyes, submission 886

---

physical distress. The observations in our service are that physical pain may not necessarily be controlled – say, in less than 5 per cent of patients we do not achieve complete control, but it can be reduced to manageable levels. But the management of existential distress is far less successful ... This is something that is not well addressed in the training of medical students and in the doctors in the postgraduate situation, and it is something that we need to focus on.<sup>64</sup>

**5.20** The Tasmanian Association of Hospice and Palliative Care (TAHPC) submitted to the Committee that:

As an association we believe that hospice and palliative care is essential in the mainstream practice of health care and it should be available to all who would be able to make use of its services [and]... that legalisation of voluntary euthanasia is not a substitute for proper provision of palliative care services to Australians.<sup>65</sup>

**5.21** At the invitation of Dr. Paul Dunne (the only palliative care specialist practising in Tasmania) the Committee visited the Whittle Ward palliative care clinic and sat in on the weekly case management meeting of the palliative care team. The Committee was appreciative of this opportunity and was most impressed with the high standards of patient care provided by the multidisciplinary team. The Committee was also impressed with the quality of the physical amenities and by the effort made to create a more ‘homely’ environment for the patients.

**5.22** Whilst the Whittle Ward was impressive the TAHPC submission highlighted some of the shortcomings in the provision of palliative care services in Tasmania that need redress.

The provision of palliative care in Tasmania is not uniform and the resources are inequitably distributed around the State ... Tasmania has only one identified Medical Specialist in Palliative care within the state and by nature of the workload specialist medical services in palliative care are only available in the south of the State. The State is fortunate in having Community Palliative Care Services in the regions and there are strong Hospice Care Associations in the north west and south. There is a palliative care unit in the south at the Repatriation General Hospital. The north has a hospice unit at the Manor Nursing Home and the Gibson Unit at St Johns Hospital, South Hobart has developed a focus for palliative care. In the rest of the State patient care is managed in Acute Care settings by medical and

---

<sup>64</sup> Professor Ravenscroft, transcript 19/6/97 p.9

<sup>65</sup> Tasmanian Association of Hospice and Palliative Care, submission 1105

---

nursing staff who have very differing levels of palliative care expertise.<sup>66</sup>

**5.23** Dr. Dunne further states that:

The Tasmanian Association for Hospice and Palliative Care is concerned that the patchy nature of palliative care in Tasmania has the potential to lead to some patients receiving less than adequate symptom control during their dying process and as a result can understand the calls for voluntary active euthanasia as a means to overcome the level of suffering that some people endure. The Association would wish to recommend to the Committee that the need for increased development and resources of hospice and palliative care services, both medically and nursing, within Tasmania is a matter of great urgency.<sup>67</sup>

**5.24** Making a submission as President of the Tasmanian Branch of the Australian Medical Association Professor Ray Lowenthal made the following comments on the state of palliative care in Tasmania:

The Tasmania model follows that generally regarded as desirable in that it integrates home care, hospital consultation and in-patient care in a hospice setting, where appropriate for each individual patient. The nursing and medical staff who operate Tasmania's Palliative Care Services have been widely praised for their ability to deliver effective palliative care in a wide variety of settings in both urban and rural areas of the state. However more funding is desperately needed to fill gaps in the provision of 24-hour cover, and to provide education for general practitioners, other medical practitioners and general nursing staff.<sup>68</sup>

**5.25** The theme of education in palliative care practices is also noted in the submission from Dr. Craig Hassed, Department of Community Medicine, Monash University.

Training for medical students and doctors in the area of palliative care is terribly deficient. For example, in the medical course at Monash University there are just 9 hours of formal palliative care teaching spanning the six years. Doctors, even those in teaching hospitals let alone GPs, are often unaware of what treatments are available.<sup>69</sup>

**5.26** The Tasmanian Aids Council contends that palliative care should not be seen as a substitute for voluntary euthanasia, but rather as another choice in a full range of therapies. This stems from a concern for the terminally ill patients for

---

<sup>66</sup> Submission 1105

<sup>67</sup> Submission 1105

<sup>68</sup> Submission 1117

<sup>69</sup> Dr. C. Hassed, Senior Lecturer, Department of Community Medicine, Monash University, submission 358

---

whom palliative care fails to provide adequate relief. The Aids Council submission notes:

Unfortunately there is a lack of consistency between specialised palliative care units, hospitals and the treatment given to those who choose to die at home. General practitioners who attend patients at home often have little or no expertise in the care of the dying and their knowledge of drug regimes for palliative care is often limited ... Patients in a hospital setting where a palliative care unit is not available are also frequently subjected to doctors with poor knowledge in this area.<sup>70</sup>

- 5.27** Senator Dr. Bob Brown's submission in favour of active voluntary euthanasia did not preclude the need for universally available quality palliative care. In his comments on the Senate Inquiry into the Euthanasia Laws Bill 1996 he suggests that:

Palliative care and active voluntary euthanasia should be seen as part of a continuum of possible treatment options rather than as mutually exclusive alternatives. Suffering patients should not be offered "palliative care or euthanasia". They should be provided with proper information about all the different ways in which their particular suffering might be managed. They should be allowed to choose active voluntary euthanasia if and when palliative care does not meet their personal needs. ...[However] suffering patients cannot make real choices about their medical treatment unless good quality palliative care services are available throughout Australia. Regardless of whether active voluntary euthanasia is legalised, both Federal and State governments have a clear obligation to ensure more resources are devoted to research, training and service provision in the palliative care area.<sup>71</sup>

- 5.28** Mr. Ben Marris, President of the Hospice Care Association of Southern Tasmania, referred the Committee to a statement made to the Senate inquiry into euthanasia, pointing to the need for continued funding commitment and a better level of professional awareness:

Funding of palliative care in Australia is a complex mix of Commonwealth, State and private funds that is not well understood by many of the players ... the development of palliative care services across Australia is now at a critical stage as it is still incomplete. For palliative care services to mature and be funded as a mainstream health service a number of milestones are yet to be achieved. [Another] area of concern is that of professional confusion. It is true to say that there still remains considerable confusion and at times downright ignorance, of

---

<sup>70</sup> Tasmanian Aids Council, submission 1108

<sup>71</sup> Submission 355

many of the details of how palliative care is provided or what it can achieve.<sup>72</sup>

## **FINDINGS**

- 5.29** The Committee found that the legalisation of voluntary euthanasia would pose a serious threat to the more vulnerable members of society and that the obligation of the state to protect all its members equally outweighs the individual's freedom to choose voluntary euthanasia.
- 5.30** From the evidence presented the Committee found that in the majority of cases palliative care was able to provide optimum care for suffering patients.
- 5.31** The Committee recognises that in a small percentage of cases palliative care is ineffective in relieving all pain, however whilst regrettable this is not sufficient cause to legalise voluntary euthanasia.
- 5.32** The Committee found that there is a need for greater resources to expand and improve the quality of palliative care services.
- 5.33** There was a demonstrated need for increased education on several levels to improve the delivery and efficacy of palliative care.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.34** The Committee strongly recommends universal access to palliative care for all patients who require it.
- 5.35** The Committee recommends that greater resources be made available to assist in improving the efficacy of palliative care. Such resources should include technical/medical and the ancillary services that focus on relieving the emotional distress of terminally ill patients.
- 5.36** The Committee recommends that specialist palliative care services be equitably distributed throughout the state.
- 5.37** Greater resources should be made available for education of medical practitioners in undergraduate and postgraduate settings. Education of general practitioners, patients and the general public is also necessary to ensure that the benefits of currently available palliative care services are understood and accessed.

---

<sup>72</sup> Mr. Ben Marris, Hospice Care Association of Southern Tasmania, submission 357

---



## SECTION 6 - ADVANCE DIRECTIVES AND LEGISLATIVE REFORM

- 6.0** In light of the Committee's recommendation that legislative recognition be given to the common law rights of patients<sup>73</sup>, two issues arise:
1. what is the nature and scope of a patient's common law rights in Australia; and
  2. what form should legislative recognition of these rights take?

### Common Law

#### *Right to consent to / refuse treatment*

- 6.1** Generally, an *adult* person who is *competent* has the common law right to:
1. consent to medical treatment; and
  2. refuse any medical treatment.
- 6.2** The source of these rights is to be found in case law, both from Australia, and from other jurisdictions which are considered persuasive in Australia<sup>74</sup>. The requirement for informed consent for medical treatment gives legal recognition to the notions of self-determination and bodily autonomy:

It is the central thesis of the common law doctrine of trespass to the person that the voluntary choices and decisions of an adult person of sound mind concerning what is or is not done to his or her body must be respected and accepted, irrespective of what others, including doctors, may think is in the best interests of that particular person. ...[T]he common law respects and preserves the autonomy of adult persons of sound mind with respect to their bodies. By doing so, the common law accepts that a person has rights of control and self-determination in respect of his or her body which other persons must respect. Those rights can only be altered with the consent of the person concerned. Thus, the legal requirement of consent to bodily interference protects the autonomy and dignity of the individual and limits the power of others to interfere with that person's body.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> See p12, Recommendations: Legislation

<sup>74</sup> In particular, England, Canada and the USA.

<sup>75</sup> *Secretary, Department of Health and Community Services (NT) v JWB and SMB (Re Marion)* (1992) 175 CLR 218 at 309, per McHugh J (HCA)

---

- 6.3** It follows from this that a competent patient can refuse any treatment, including life-saving or life-prolonging treatment.<sup>76</sup> This right extends to refusing to continue treatment which is currently being administered. That is, a patient may require the withdrawal of treatment.<sup>77</sup>
- 6.4** Importantly, if a patient is no longer competent, or is unable to express his or her consent to / refusal of treatment, the common law gives recognition and effect to such wishes of the patient as are:
1. clear and competently given; and
  2. applicable to the current circumstances.
- 6.5** Therefore, a competent person may give directions as to the medical treatment they will consent to or refuse in circumstances which have not yet arisen<sup>78</sup>. Thus:
- ... an anticipatory choice which, if clearly established and applicable in the circumstances - two big “ifs” - *would bind the practitioner*. ...
- Neither the personal circumstances of the patient nor a speculative answer to the question “What would the patient have chosen?” can bind the practitioner in his choice of whether of not to treat or not to treat *or justify him in acting contrary to a clearly established anticipatory refusal to accept treatment ...*<sup>79</sup>
- 6.6** If however, the patient’s wishes are not either clear or applicable, then factors such as personal circumstances, or inquiries into what they might have chosen, become useful (although not binding) tools in making decisions about treatment<sup>80</sup>.
- 6.7** The Courts have accepted that there is a legitimate interest of the State in preserving life (that interest reflecting the notions of the respect for, and the sanctity of, human life). However, this interest must be balanced against the individual patient’s autonomy. Where the patient’s wishes are clear and

---

<sup>76</sup> Australia: *Rogers v Whitaker* (1992) 175 CLR 479 (HCA)

England: *Sidaway v Bethlehem Royal Hospital and Maudsley Hospital* [1985] AC 871 (HL); *Re T (Adult: Refusal of Treatment)* [1993] Fam 96 (CA); *Re C (Adult: Refusal of Medical Treatment)* [1994] 1 FLR 31 (CA); *Re JT (Adult: Refusal of Treatment)* [1998] 1 FLR 48

Canada: *Malette v Schulman* (1990) 72 OR (2d) 417 (CA); *Nancy B v Hotel Dieu de Quebec* (1992) 86 DLR (4<sup>th</sup>) 385 (Que. SC).

<sup>77</sup> Although there is no Australian authority directly on point, the position seems clear from the following:

*Re T (Adult: Refusal of Treatment)* [1993] Fam 96 (CA); *Airdale National Health Service Trust v Bland* [1993] AC 789 (HL); *Nancy B v Hotel Dieu de Quebec* (1992) 86 DLR (4<sup>th</sup>) 385 (Que. SC).

<sup>78</sup> This position is clearly established under English authority, and likely to be the case in Australia on the basis of the persuasive value of the authority.

<sup>79</sup> *Re T (Adult: Refusal of Treatment)* [1993] Fam 96 (CA), per Lord Donald of Lymington MR. See also *Re C (Adult: Refusal of Medical Treatment)* [1994] 1 FLR 31 (CA).

<sup>80</sup> See for example, *Dying with Dignity: Draft Interim Guidelines on Management* (Community & Health Services, Tasmania, November 1994), p2 (Consultation).

---

applicable, the principle of sanctity of life yields to that of self-determination.<sup>81</sup>

- 6.8** This is not to say that a patient can *require* a doctor to assist him/her to die by taking active steps to end his/her life. A person cannot demand treatment that would conflict with the doctor's duty to preserve life, but s/he can demand that existing treatment be discontinued.

### **Competence**

- 6.9** It has been seen that an important pre-requisite to the exercise of either actual or anticipatory refusal of / consent to treatment, is that the person be competent. The likely test to be applied in Australia is that referred to in the leading English case of *Re C*<sup>82</sup>. Accordingly, a competent person must be able to:

1. comprehend and retain information regarding treatment;
2. believe that information; and
3. weigh it in the balance to arrive at a choice.<sup>83</sup>

- 6.10** One of the standards that has been applied in determining whether the patient comprehends the relevant information, is to say that s/he needs to understand in broad terms the nature of the treatment, and the consequences of refusing it.<sup>84</sup>

- 6.11** Temporary factors (such as pain, shock or the influence of drugs) may impair or remove a person's capacity, but it will be a question of degree whether or not those factors operate sufficiently to limit or remove capacity in the circumstances.<sup>85</sup>

- 6.12** Importantly, at common law, every adult person is *presumed competent*.<sup>86</sup> It is for anyone seeking to challenge that person's capacity to show that that presumption is rebutted by his/her failure to meet the above three criteria. It is of critical importance to note that a decision to refuse treatment may not in and of itself be used to rebut the presumption of competence. A decision to refuse treatment is valid even where the reason for refusal is irrational, unknown or

---

<sup>81</sup> *Secretary of State for the Home Department v Robb* [1995] Fam 127 (FD); *Re T (Adult: Refusal of Treatment)* [1993] Fam 96 (CA).

<sup>82</sup> [1994] 1 FLR 31 (CA)

<sup>83</sup> *id* at 36. Applied in *Secretary of State for the Home Department v Robb* [1995] Fam 127 (FD); *Re MB (Medical Treatment)* [1997] 2 FLR 426; *Re JT (Adult: Refusal of Treatment)* [1998] 1 FLR 48; *R v Collin & Ors, ex parte S* (unreported, CA, 7 May 1998).

<sup>84</sup> *Re T (Adult: Refusal of Treatment)* [1993] Fam 96 (CA).

<sup>85</sup> *Re MB (Medical Treatment)* [1997] 2 FLR 426

<sup>86</sup> *Re MB (Medical Treatment)* [1997] 2 FLR 426; *Re JT (Adult: Refusal of Treatment)* [1998] 1 FLR 48; *R v Collins & Ors, ex parte S* (unreported, CA, 7 May 1998). Note that general mental impairment is not sufficient to rebut the presumption. In both *Re C* and *Re JT*, the patient suffered from a mental disability which required institutionalisation, but was competent to make treatment decisions (in each case the patient was likely to die without treatment and the refusal was upheld).

morally repugnant.<sup>87</sup> One may not compel a competent patient refusing treatment to undergo medical intervention to benefit another person.<sup>88</sup>

- 6.13** If a person is incompetent or has not made an anticipatory decision about treatment, then the common law requires that the person be treated in accordance with his/her own best interests<sup>89</sup>. Few legal guidelines exist which provide criteria for determining what ‘best interests’ means<sup>90</sup>. Generally, as far as possible, the person’s wishes or attitudes should be determined, and their personal circumstances taken into account. However, there is legal authority for the fact that other parties’ interests are not directly relevant. If treatment of the incapacitated patient would benefit another person, this is only relevant to the extent that helping the other person would directly benefit the patient.<sup>91</sup>

### Legislative Provisions in Other Jurisdictions

- 6.14** Throughout Australia, legislation exists which allows the appointment of a substitute decision-maker. These decision-makers may variously be termed guardians, attorneys or medical agents and they are empowered to make substituted judgements for the patient. Guardians may be appointed by a competent adult, or they may be appointed by a Guardianship Board once the Board is satisfied that the patient cannot make decisions for him/herself. Generally, decisions made by a guardian must accord with the patient’s best interests and are reviewable by a Guardianship Board.
- 6.15** Additionally, several States have enacted legislation which allows a patient to specify in advance whether there are treatments which s/he refuses to have, or specifying certain conditions under which certain treatment is not to be provided.<sup>92</sup>

### Limitations

- 6.16** Advance directive legislation in Australia tends to be limited to treatment decisions concerning refusal of treatment, rather than specifying which treatments the person would request and will consent to.
- 6.17** To some extent, this has been dealt with in the Queensland legislation which provides, *inter alia*, for “Ulysses agreements” (which give advance consent to

---

<sup>87</sup> *Re MB (Medical Treatment)* [1997] 2 FLR 426; *R v Collins & Ors, ex parte S* (unreported, CA, 7 May 1998).

<sup>88</sup> *McFall v. Shimp* (1978) 10 Pa. D. & C. 3d 90 (Allegheny County Ct. 1978); *In Re AC* (1990) 573 A.2d 1235; 1990 D.C. App.

<sup>89</sup> *Secretary, Department of Health and Community Services (NT) v JWB and SMB (Re Marion)* (1992) 175 CLR 218.

<sup>90</sup> *Id.*, per Brennan J.

<sup>91</sup> *In Re Y (Mental Patient: Bone Marrow Donation)* [1997] Fam 110; *Re GWW and CMW* (1997) FLC 92-748.

<sup>92</sup> *Medical Treatment Act* 1988 (Vic); *Natural Death Act* 1988 (NT); *Medical Treatment Act* 1994 (ACT); *Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act* 1995 (SA); *Powers of Attorney Act* 1998 (Qld)

---

treatment, even when that treatment may be objected to later on under certain conditions). The Committee heard that this feature of the Queensland legislation was particularly useful and desirable.<sup>93</sup> However, another significant limitation to the usefulness of advance directives made under the Queensland scheme exists. This is to be found in the provision that doctors need not comply with a direction if s/he reasonably considers it is unsound or uncertain. It would be better to make any uncertainty subject to independent review (e.g. by a Guardianship Board), rather than give a doctor the discretion to ignore a directive based on his/her reading of it.

- 6.18** The legislation in the Northern Territory and in South Australia only applies when the patient is suffering a life-threatening illness, and the advance refusal relates only to life-sustaining measures. These restrictions are unduly narrow and pose unnecessary limitations on a patient's ability to make decisions about future treatment. In light of the Committee's recommendation to give effect to a patient's rights at common law, these limits are undesirable in any proposed Tasmanian legislation. Further, the practical difficulty of determining in any given situation the meaning a scope of terms such as "life-threatening illness", makes their inclusion undesirable.
- 6.19** The Victorian and ACT Acts provide a discrete mechanism for creating advance directives in health care. Although this method allows a person to express his or her own wishes, the evidence before the Committee<sup>94</sup> supports the view that combining the ability to give directives with a system of enduring guardianship is preferable. This ensures that there is a person who knows and is trusted by the patient to ensure compliance with his/her wishes and to speak for the patient when any directive is unclear.

...[An advance directive alone] is not particularly fluid, it is not really open to interpretation, whereas an enduring guardianship is far more fluid and far more responsive to the situation that occurs...<sup>95</sup>

- 6.20** For this reason, a system such as that introduced in Queensland, which combines the functionality of advance directives with the flexibility of guardianship, is desirable.

#### ***Guardianship and Administration Act 1995 (Tasmania)***

- 6.21** In Tasmania, the *Guardianship and Administration Act 1995* provides for the appointment of a guardian, either by the Guardianship Board or by a competent adult person. In either case, the guardianship becomes effective upon the patient becoming incompetent to make his/her own decisions.
- 6.22** Where a person appoints their own enduring guardian (under s32), s/he may state as part of that appointment, any conditions to which the guardianship

---

<sup>93</sup> Mr John Burns Blackwood, 19 May 1998 (Transcript, p3-4).

<sup>94</sup> See for example, Dr Margaret Otlowski, 28 April 1998 (Transcript, p2, 5); Mr John Burns Blackwood, 19 May 1998 (Transcript p5) and Ms Deborah Firth, 3 November 1997 (Transcript p3).

<sup>95</sup> Ms Deborah Firth, 3 November 1997 (Transcript p3).

---

powers are subject. The appointment must be made in writing in a prescribed form, witnessed and registered with the Board. The actions of an enduring guardian are reviewable by the Board and the appointment may be revoked.

- 6.23** The Act only allows the appointment of one enduring guardian, and the prescribed form of appointment (Form 11) provides only for simultaneous witnessing of both the appointment and acceptance portions of the appointment instrument.
- 6.24** The Act authorises an enduring guardian to consent to dental or medical treatment (s39), and it is arguable, but not clear, that this could extend to withdrawing treatment<sup>96</sup>. Further limitations exist in relation to decisions about particular types of treatment ('special treatment', defined in s4). In its current form, these limitations would extend to the conditions specified in the appointment.

### Implementation

- 6.25** The Committee heard that the existing *Guardianship and Administration Act* 1995 (Tasmania) is sufficient to give some effect to a patient's right to make advance directives by appointing a guardian and expressing conditions on that appointment relating to medical treatment.<sup>97</sup> However, the Committee heard evidence that part of the problem with the non-use of advance directives, was the uncertainty as to their legal effect and the lack of knowledge about them:

There is certainly a perception, a very, very high perception, amongst the general community and professionals that advanced directives are not legal in Australia. Okay. Now in time that might change; you can change it overnight with legislation.<sup>98</sup>

- 6.26** Thus, in the interests of giving legislative certainty to the binding nature of advance directives, specific recognition of advance directives would be beneficial.
- 6.27** In previous studies conducted to investigate perceptions of advance directives, the majority of community opinion thought they would be beneficial<sup>99</sup>. However, overwhelmingly, the literature and evidence before the Committee indicated that one of the major obstacles to implementing a system of advance directives in health care, was the lack of professional and public awareness about them.<sup>100</sup> It would therefore be critical to combine any legislative reform

<sup>96</sup> See comments by Dr Margaret Otlowski, 28 April 1998 (Transcript, p4)

<sup>97</sup> Mr John Burns Blackwood, 19 May 1998 (Transcript p2) and Dr Margaret Otlowski, 28 April 1998 (Transcript, p2).

<sup>98</sup> Mr John Burns Blackwood, 19 May 1998 (Transcript p5)

<sup>99</sup> Ashby, M & Wakefield, M, "Attitudes to some aspects of death and dying, living wills and substituted health care decision-making in South Australia: public opinion survey for a parliamentary select committee" *Palliative Medicine* 1993; 7: 273-82.

<sup>100</sup> See for example: 'Advance directives rarely used' (1997) News in Brief, 16(3) *Monash Bioethics Review* 11; Ashby, M & Wakefield, M, "Attitudes to some aspects of death and dying, living wills and substituted health care decision-making in South Australia: public opinion survey for a parliamentary

with a programme designed to educate the public, as well as the medical and legal professions, about the existence of and uses for an advance directive. In particular, resources should be made available to promote awareness and offer advice to those wishing to make a directive. Possible avenues for promotion include: the Guardianship Board itself (materials and facilitator/s); promotion via the legal profession (information pamphlets, combine with advice on wills etc.; raise awareness by professional seminars); raised awareness through health care providers (informational pamphlets; seminars stressing legality).

- 6.28** Another issue that was raised before the Committee was the requirement under Tasmanian legislation for registration of an instrument appointing an enduring guardian. Firstly, it should be made clear that failure to register will not invalidate the common law effect of an advance directive. However, registration with the Board is required under the Act to appoint a guardian, so the issue would become: do the conditions specified in an instrument remain valid, even if the appointment does not? This matter should be clarified, and the opinion expressed to the Committee was that the effect of a written directive regarding future treatment should still be respected as valid, even if not registered.<sup>101</sup> Secondly, adequate resources must be made available to implement efficient systems to register and retrieve directives lodged with the Board.
- 6.29** It is desirable to allow the appointment of an alternative enduring guardian, in the event that one is unable or unwilling to act. Although both the appointment and acceptance of a guardian must be witnessed, provision should be made for separate witnessing (provided that the acceptance was signed after the appointment section<sup>102</sup>). This would facilitate the appointment of a guardian who did not necessarily live in close proximity to the appointor, but who nevertheless was willing and able to accept the appointment.
- 6.30** Finally, if the intention is to give legislative recognition to a person's existing rights at common law, then any legislation should be careful not to place undue restrictions on those rights. It is as important to pay attention to what the proposed legislation *should not do*, as to what it should do. Therefore, it is important that any legislation introduced to achieve this purpose should expressly state that it is addition to, and does not derogate from, a patient's rights at common law.<sup>103</sup>

## Recommendations

- 6.31** The *Guardianship and Administration Act 1995* (Tasmania) be amended to include express provisions dealing with the ability to give advance directives relating to medical treatment to an appointed guardian. The model and scope

---

select committee" *Palliative Medicine* 1993; 7: 273-82; Ms Margaret Brown, 5 November 1997 (Transcript p12-14).

<sup>101</sup> Mr John Burns Blackwood, 19 May 1998 (Transcript p7)

<sup>102</sup> See for example the provisions of the West Australian legislation on enduring guardianship.

<sup>103</sup> See for example the provisions in the Victorian legislation (s4(1) and s8(3)).

---

of provisions adopted in Queensland should be used as a guide. These provisions should include:

- 6.31.1** the ability to appoint an alternative enduring guardian, in the case of the first being unable or unwilling to act; and
  - 6.31.2** amendments to the witnessing requirements and forms, such that independent witnessing of the appointment and acceptance parts of the appointment instrument (Form 11) is possible.
- 6.32** The power of a guardian to request withdrawal of treatment (in addition to the ability, currently under s39, to consent to treatment) pursuant to directives should be clarified.
- 6.33** Any legislative provisions should not derogate from, or impose undue limitations upon, a patient's common law rights. In particular
- 6.33.1** express provisions should be included which preserve the rights of patients under any other law to consent to, or to refuse, treatment; and
  - 6.33.2** no provision should be included which allows doctors not to comply with a valid directive on the basis of their own judgement of its soundness or certainty. Rather, the substituted judgement of the enduring guardian should be respected, subject to review by the Guardianship Board in appropriate cases (as is the case under current provisions).
- 6.34** Legislative reform should be coupled with a programme to promote the understanding and use of advance directives amongst the general public and the legal and medical professions.
- 6.35** Adequate resources should be provided to effect registration and promotion of advance directives.

Parliament House, Hobart

2 June 1998

Hon. J. L. Jackson MHA

Chairperson.



## APPENDIX 1

### SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED AND TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE

- |     |   |     |   |
|-----|---|-----|---|
| 1.  | Mrs. E. J. Springer,<br>PO Box 43, Legana, 7277,  | 16. | Mr. John J. Allchin, 22 Denison<br>Grove, Launceston 7250                               |
| 2.  | Mrs. Marjorie Nicholls,<br>22 Main Road, Port Sorell 7307   | 17. | Mr. David Heckscher, PO Box 47,<br>Newstead 7250  |
| 3.  | Ms. Adrienne Baldock,<br>200 Hyden Road,<br>Geilston Bay, 7016,   | 18. | Mrs. Elizabeth Heckscher,<br>PO Box 47, Newstead 7250                                   |
| 4.  | Mr. and Mrs. J. & G. Wilson,<br>7 Balaka Place, Launceston 7250   | 19. | Rev. Allan Quak ,<br>22 Pitten Crief, Riverside 7250                                    |
| 5.  | Senator Eric Abetz,<br>GPO Box 1675, Hobart 7001  | 20. | Mr. Rodney Ralph,<br>5 Allwinton Court, Waverley 7250                                   |
| 6.  | Erik Leipoldt, B.Soc.Sci. (Human<br>Services),, 3 Warruga Way,<br>Wanneroo, WA 6065                     | 21. | Mrs. M. B. O'Brien,<br>1 Pontifex Street,<br>Queenstown 7467                            |
| 7.  | Dr. Paul Dunne, "Bowden Park",<br>29 Bowden Street, Glenorchy<br>7010                                   | 22. | Mr. John Heckscher, 124 Abbott<br>Street, Launceston 7250                               |
| 8.  | Mr. Keith Thompson,<br>31 Warremar Way<br>Oyster Cove 7150  | 23. | Mrs. Mary Holmes,<br>PO Box 89, Queenstown 7467   |
| 9.  | Ms. Peggy Rogers,<br>96 High Street, Launceston 7250  | 24. | Ms. Helen Andrewartha,<br>59 Coolamon Road,<br>Taroona 7053                             |
| 10. | Mr. R. de Boer,<br>RSD 221, Railton 7305  | 25. | Ms. Gillian M. Roberts,<br>25 McFarlane Street,<br>South Hobart 7004                    |
| 11. | Mrs. M. Nibbs,<br>The Australian Family Association,<br>Tasmanian Branch, PO Box 191,<br>Devonport 7310 | 26. | Ms. Lois Nichols,<br>St. Mary's Church, 1 Springfield<br>Avenue, Moonah 7009            |
| 12. | Mrs. Rhonda Sullivan,<br>1 Eden Place, Howrah 7018  | 27. | Mr. & Mrs. B. Verdouw,<br>2 Bampi Court,<br>Blackmans Bay 7052                          |
| 13. | Mr. Cyril Oakley,<br>55 Grove Road, Glenorchy 7010  | 28. | Mr. & Mrs. D.A. & G. T. Kearney,<br>30 Fairway Drive, Redwood Village,<br>Kingston 7050 |
| 14. | Mrs. Margaret Adkins,<br>31 York Street, Sandy Bay 7005   | 29. | Mrs. Mary Colman,<br>47 David Street, Newstead 7250                                     |
| 15. | Mrs. Irene Richards, 47 Cotton<br>Street, Latrobe 7307  | 30. | Mr. G. Sessarego,<br>2/5 Wyndella Street,<br>West Launceston 7250                       |

- 
- |     |  |     |  |
|-----|--|-----|--|
| 31. | Mr. & Mrs. T. & A. Pickford,<br>47 Ronneby Road, Newnham 7248  | 49. | Sister Lucy Healey,<br>Parish Sister, "Villa Maria",<br>6 Buscombe Street, Bellerive 7018  |
| 32. | Rev. R. Cameron-Smith,<br>6 Delmore Court, Prospect 7250   | 50. | Ms. Yvonne Sheddock,<br>PO Box 995, Burnie, 7320   |
| 33. | Mrs. P. Calder,<br>23 Rosehill Crescent,<br>Lenah Valley 7008  | 51. | Mr. John H. Niebuur,<br>10 Douglas Street, Launceston 7250   |
| 34. | Dr. & Mrs. A. Ritar,<br>42 Norwood Avenue,<br>Taroona TAS 7053   | 52. | The Hon. H. E. Cosgrove, AM, QC,<br>66 The Esplanade, Rose Bay 7015,   |
| 35. | Mrs. M. H. Bamping,<br>Secretary, Regional Council,<br>Secular Franciscan Order,<br>56 Forest Road, Trevallyn 7250 | 53. | Sister Elizabeth Finn,<br>6 Buscombe Street, Bellerive 7018,   |
| 36. | Mr. P. J. Sullivan,<br>"Brenock", Masons Road,<br>Rosevears 7277   | 54. | Mr. J. J. Shields,<br>13 Morley Road,<br>West Riverside 7250   |
| 37. | Mrs. J. MacFarlane,<br>32 Fryett Street, Launceston 7250   | 55. | Mr. Wilfred Gale,<br>1/17 Hill Side Crescent,<br>West Launceston 7250  |
| 38. | Ms. Margaret Henderson,<br>5/13 Cutler Place,<br>West Moonah 7009  | 56. | Ms. Margaret Clougher,<br>41 Flinders Esplanade,<br>Taroona 7053   |
| 39. | Mrs. Anne Vincent,<br>27 Irby Boulevarde,<br>Sisters Beach 7321,   | 57. | Mrs. Joan Taylor,<br>8/44 Cross Street, New Town 7008  |
| 40. | Mr. Fred Lethbridge,<br>2 Southview Crescent<br>New Norfolk 7140   | 58. | Mrs. Sheila Vollprecht,<br>3/16 Balmain Street,<br>Glenorchy, 7010   |
| 41. | John H. S. Heidenreich,<br>St. Peter's Lutheran Church,<br>207 Davey Street, Hobart 7000                           | 59. | Mrs. Christina Campton,<br>50 Main Road, Claremont 7011  |
| 42. | Mr. Geoffrey Wood,<br>471 Churchill Avenue,<br>Sandy Bay 7005  | 60. | Mr. Bert Van Galen,<br>99 Conway Street, Launceston 7250   |
| 43. | Mr. Hank Bethlehem,<br>79 Kaoota Road, Rose Bay 7015   | 61. | Mr. Paul Campton,<br>50 Main Road, Claremont 7011  |
| 44. | Mr. Robert J. Ryan,<br>563 Channel Highway,<br>Bonnet Hill 7053  | 62. | Carolynn Jamieson,<br>c.jamieson@ais.gu.edu.au   |
| 45. | Mrs. J. Cameron-Smith,<br>6 Delmore Court, Prospect 7250,  | 63. | Mr. E. J. Holmes,<br>1 Nansen Court, Margate 7054  |
| 46. | Mrs. J. M. Vautin,<br>PO Box 415, Launceston 7250  | 64. | Ms. Val Hughes,<br>9 Durkins Road, Quoiba 7310,  |
| 47. | Mrs. J. Verdow & family,<br>53 Tingira Road,<br>Blackmans Bay 7053   | 65. | Mr. John Brereton,<br>31 Sanders Street, Glenorchy 7010  |
| 48. | Mrs. J. Lethbridge,<br>2 Southview Crescent,<br>New Norfolk 7140   | 66. | Mr. Broer Westerbeek,<br>26 Douglas Street,<br>East Devonport 7310   |
|     |  | 67. | Mrs. M. Peters,<br>Social Responsibility Co-ordinator,<br>The Mothers' Union in Australia,<br>206 Oldaker Street, Devonport 7310 |
-

- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>68. Mrs. Mavis Whelan,<br/>16 Hoffman Street,<br/>Midway Point 7171</p> <p>69. Sr. Eileen Ryan,<br/>Our Lady of Sacred Heart Convent,<br/>PO Box 585,<br/>Queenstown 7467</p> <p>70. Dr. P. J. McCleave,<br/>59 The Crescent, Ascot Vale,<br/>Victoria 3032</p> <p>71. Mr. &amp; Mrs. H. &amp; A. Vos,<br/>8 St. Albans Court, Grindelwald 7277</p> <p>72. Mrs. C. Page,<br/>5 King Street, Railton 7305,</p> <p>73. Ms. Stefani Glivka,<br/>14 Mt. View Road, Glenorchy 7010</p> <p>74. Mr. Francis Halpin,<br/>Marion Farm, Latrobe 7307</p> <p>75. Mrs. Edith Crothers,<br/>Unit 58, "Ainslie House",<br/>Launceston 7249</p> <p>76. Ms. Aartje J. H. Hoogenhout,<br/>17 Batten Street, Launceston 7250</p> <p>77. Ms. Debryn Halpin,<br/>Bass Highway, Latrobe 7307</p> <p>78. Ms. Dagmar Green,<br/>3 Sandy Point Avenue,<br/>Lewisham 7173</p> <p>79. Mrs. Geraldine Stewart,<br/>Unit 11, 31 St. John Street,<br/>Ulverstone, 7315</p> <p>80. Mr. A. J. McMahon,<br/>Executive Director,<br/>The Law Society of Tasmania,<br/>28 Murray Street, Hobart 7000</p> <p>81. Mr. Phillip Vincent,<br/>42 Duke Street, Sandy Bay 7005</p> <p>82. Dr. D. B. Paterson,<br/>97 Wells Parade,<br/>Blackmans Bay 7052</p> <p>83. Mrs. J. K. Sullivan,<br/>30 Penquite Road, Launceston 7250</p> <p>84. Dr. A. K. Saha,<br/>52 Elphin Road, Launceston 7250,</p> <p>85. Sr. Sylvia Cleary,<br/>PO Box 547, Wynyard, 7325,</p> <p>86. Mr. &amp; Mrs. R. &amp; C. Hand,<br/>"The Pines",</p> | <p>13 Browns Road, Kingston, 7050</p> <p>87. Mrs. J. E. Bligh &amp; Mrs. A. M. Ralston,<br/>5 Lynd Court, Devonport, 7310</p> <p>88. Mr. R. L. Stewart,<br/>9 Evans Street, Atherton,<br/>Queensland 4883</p> <p>89. Mr. A. W. Hartwig,<br/>Federal Treasurer, Christian Medical<br/>and Dental Fellowship of Australia,<br/>37 Birdwood Terrace, Auchenflower,<br/>Queensland 4066</p> <p>90. Ms. E. M. Coleman,<br/>4 Bambra Street, Roches Beach 7021</p> <p>91. Mr. Patrick Curtis,<br/>27 Silwood Avenue, Howrah, 7018</p> <p>92. Mrs. J. Hayes,<br/>3 Grace Street, Hamilton 7140,</p> <p>93. Mrs. P. M. Dunbabin,<br/>9 Imlay Street, Dunalley 7177</p> <p>94. The Dawson Family,<br/>C/- Mrs. E. Dawson,<br/>Box 16, Franklin 7113</p> <p>95. Ms. E. M. Gow,<br/>Box 533, Queenstown 7467</p> <p>96. Ms. Wilma Langerak,<br/>9 Bartley Street, Hadspen 7290</p> <p>97. Mrs. G. A. Saha,<br/>67 Rannoch Avenue, Riverside 7250</p> <p>98. Mr. B. T. Sutherland,<br/>GPO Box 536, Darwin, NT 0801</p> <p>99. Mrs. M. Stonehouse,<br/>101 Punchbowl Road,<br/>South Launceston, 7249</p> <p>100. Mr. A. Crothers,<br/>79 Barn Terrace, Trevallyn 7250</p> <p>101. Ms. Helen Hickey,<br/>47 David Street, Newstead 7250</p> <p>102. Mrs. G. Kohler,<br/>60 Bienefelts Road, Ulverstone 7315</p> <p>103. Ms. Anna Nelson,<br/>248 Vermont Road, Launceston 7250</p> <p>104. Ms. Carola H. Morgan<br/>(plus 3 other signatures),<br/>6 Nicholls Street, Devonport 7310</p> <p>105. Mr. A. Brady,<br/>13 Vermeer Avenue, Newnham 7248</p> |
|---|--|
-

- 
- |      |  |      |   |
|------|--|------|---|
| 106. | Mrs. E. M. Wilkinson,<br>24 Frederick Henry Parade,<br>Cremorne, 7024  | 123. | Ms. Lorna Lloyd-Green, CBE,<br>14/723 Orrong Road,<br>Toorak, Vic. 3142 |
| 107. | Mr. Ben Heckscher,<br>3 Kelly Court, Redcliffe, Qld. 4020  | 124. | Mrs. M. N. Dilger,<br>43 Esplanade, Queenstown 7467                     |
| 108. | Mr. & Mrs. A. & Y Varadi,<br>West Moonah 7009  | 125. | Ms. R. Eilander,<br>21 Reiby Street, Hadspen, 7290                      |
| 109. | Mr. J. H. Cummins,<br>1/27 Lanena Street, Bellerive 7018   | 126. | Mr. J. Stonehouse,<br>101 Punchbowl Road,<br>South Launceston 7250      |
| 110. | Ms. Carol Prichard,<br>"Brackenhurst", Brightwater<br>Road, Blackmans Bay 7052   | 127. | Ms. Violet E. Dillon,<br>2 Wakehurst Road,<br>Austins Ferry 7011        |
| 111. | Mr. C. Lynch,<br>38 Waldron Street, Claremont 7011   | 128. | Mr. Tim Morgan,<br>4/15 Allawah Street, Riverside 7250                  |
| 112. | Mrs D. Laning,<br>P.O. Box 218, Kingston 7051  | 129. | Mr. David Ratkowsky,<br>20 York Street, Sandy Bay 7005                  |
| 113. | Ed & Joyce Kleywegt,<br>149 Derwent Avenue,<br>Lindisfarne 7015  | 130. | Mrs. I. Olding,<br>54 Amy Road, Launceston 7250                         |
| 114. | Mr Sydney John Robert Grubb &<br>Janet Mary Grubb,<br>63 Beach Street, Bellerive 7018  | 131. | Mrs. Lyndle Van Zetten,<br>18 New Ecclestone Road,<br>Launceston 7250   |
| 115. | Mr Mike Hall,<br>Health & Community Services Union,<br>71 Elphin Road, Launceston 7250   | 132. | Mr. M. E. O'Bryan,<br>167 Opossum Road,<br>Launceston, 7250             |
| 116. | Mr Vince Nesbitt,<br>"Cedar Lodge", Narone Lane,<br>Wollombi, NSW 2325   | 133. | Mrs. D. J. Thorne,<br>34 Deal Street, Ulverstone 7315                   |
| 117. | Mr Robert Manne,<br>Editor of Quadrant, Associate<br>Professor of Politics, La Trobe<br>University, Columnist with The<br>Australian | 134. | Dr. Donald Beard,<br>332 South Terrace,<br>Adelaide S.A.5000            |
| 118. | Dr. David W. Kissane,<br>Professor/Director,<br>Centre for Palliative Care,<br>104 Studley Park Road,<br>Kew, Vic. 3101              | 135. | Ms. Jo Dowe,<br>56 View Street, Sandy Bay 7005                          |
| 119. | Mrs. Susan Walker,<br>46 Wellesley Street,<br>South Hobart 7004  | 136. | Mrs. Dawn Morris,<br>307 Clarence Street, Howrah 7018                   |
| 120. | Miss. S. Yasuda,<br>24 Stanley Street, Bellerive, 7018   | 137. | Mrs. S. McDonald,<br>46 Fern Street, Kingston 7050                      |
| 121. | Rev. Austin Brehaut,<br>St. Luke's Rectory,<br>PO Box46, Latrobe 7307  | 138. | Mrs. C. Cooper,<br>5A/40 Topham Street,<br>Rose Bay, 7015               |
| 122. | Mrs. Margaret Maling,<br>43 Esplanade,<br>Kingston Beach 7050  | 139. | Ms. Olga E. Bell,<br>2/7 Alroy Court, Rosetta 7010                      |
|      |  | 140. | Dr. A. R. Lorbati,<br>10 Falmouth Close, Geraldton<br>W.A. 6530         |
|      |  | 141. | Mr. T. A. Weatherly,<br>3/22 Runnymede Street,<br>Battery Point, 7004   |
-

- Launceston 7250
142. Dr. M. Kehila,  
PO Box 96, Rosebery 7470
143. Mr. & Mrs. D. Alexander,  
4 Roseneath Place,  
Austins Ferry 7011
144. Mrs. B. Ross,  
52 Rosny Esplanade,  
Rosny Park 7018
145. Mr. & Mrs. B. Morris,  
Lot 12 Meethenar Street,  
Carlton, Tas. 7173
146. Professor Ray Lowenthal,  
& 1117. President, Tas. Branch of the  
Australian Medical Association,  
2 Gore Street, South Hobart, 7004
147. Mr. J. McP. Cartledge,  
"Invercoe", 70 Hampden Road  
Battery Point, 7004
148. Mr. N. K. Roberts,  
11 Sharps Road, Lenah Valley 7008
149. Mr. Darren Powell,  
6 Radcliff Crescent, Rosetta 7011
150. Mr. Roy Mann, Chairman,  
"Beth Shean" Inc.,  
Kimberley Road, Mersey Lea 7305
151. Ms. Joan M. Worth,  
9 Gravelly Beach Road,  
Blackwall, Tas 7275
152. Mr. Frank Reynolds,  
199 Mount Street,  
Upper Burnie 7320
153. Mr. & Mrs. N. Bosker,  
Chalet 18, Waldhorn Drive,  
Grindelwald 7277
154. Ms. M. A. McGee,  
57 Bourke Street, Launceston 7250
155. Mrs. D. M. Burk,  
Main Road, Wesley Vale 7307
156. Mrs. Dawn Burk, Secretary,  
St. Luke's Anglican Church  
Women's Guild, Main Road,  
Wesley Vale 7307
157. Ms. Karen Becker,  
4 Rowlands Court, Kingston 7050
158. Ms. Jenifer Ward (no address  
supplied)
159. Mrs. Janet Overton,  
PO Box 1, Riverside Post Office,
160. The Venerable Father Michael,  
St. Petroc Monastery,  
St. Petroc House, McRobies Road,  
South Hobart 7004
161. Rev. G. Preece & Rev. A. Sloane,  
Ridley College,  
University of Melbourne,  
160 The Avenue, Parkville 3052
162. Miss. H. Fisher,  
2/7 Rennie Court, Norwood, 7250
163. Mrs. J. S. Woollard,  
2/9 Cyrus Court, Rose Bay 7015
164. Mr. & Mrs. W. Stephens,  
4 Wentworth Street,  
Launceston 7250
165. Ms. P. Challis,  
11 Coleville Street, Battery Point 7004
166. Mrs. J. de Jong,  
4 West Park Drive, Launceston 7250
167. Mr. G. D. Button,  
21A Chifley Street,  
Kingsmeadows 7249
168. Miss Patricia Leamey,  
2/63 Brent Street, Glenorchy 7011
169. Mr. & Mrs. P. Sawar,  
RA 25 Hortons Road, Redpa 7330
170. Dr. R. Woodruff,  
Suite 9, 210 Burgundy Street,  
Heidelberg 3084
171. Ms. K. Cuthbertson,  
10 Montpelier Drive, Prospect, 7250
172. Ms. A. Ortolan,  
137 Springfield Avenue,  
West Moonah, 7009
173. Mr. B. Bresnehan,  
7 Warruga Place, Devonport 7310
174. Mr. & Mrs. E. J. & L. A. Bolton,  
Boat Harbour Beach, Tas. 7321
175. Mrs. L. A. Bolton,  
Boat Harbour Beach, Tas 7321
176. Mr. & Mrs. E. Jelfs,  
344 Carella Street, Howrah 7018
177. Miss M. A. Birch,  
PO Box 459, Queenstown 7467
178. Mr. P. A. Young,

- 119 Abbotsfield Road,  
Claremont 7011
179. Mrs. M. Hewitt,  
188 Mount Street, Burnie 7320
180. Unreadable name,  
PO Box 291, Latrobe 7307
181. Dr. T. J. O'Brien,  
"Emu Cottage", 19 McKillop  
Street, Geelong 3220
182. Ms. J. Shackcloth,  
22/1 La Perouse Street,  
Warrane 7018
183. Mrs. M. J. Williams,  
326 Nelson Road, Mt. Nelson, 7007
184. Mr. and Mrs. P. Schott,  
100 Newdegate Street,  
West Hobart 7000
185. Maj.Gen. W. B. James, AO, MBE, MC,  
(RL), PO  
Box 572, Spring Hill, Qld. 4004.
186. Ms. B. Gurr,  
8 Dodson Street, Rosetta 7010,
187. Pastor J. W. Salmon,  
Hon. Secretary, Eastern Shore  
Minister's Association, PO Box 79,  
Lindisfarne 7015
188. Mr. B. Holderness-Roddam,  
155 Main Road, Austins Ferry 7011
189. Dr. B. Walpole,  
Staff Specialist, Emergency Medicine,  
Royal Hobart Hospital  
GPO Box 1061L, Hobart 7001
190. Mrs. G. D. Button,  
21A Chifley Street,  
Kings Meadows 7249.
191. Mr. I. Harrington,  
118 Hill Street, West Hobart 7000
192. Mr. D. Perrin, MP,  
Member for Bulleen,  
PO Box 319, Bulleen, 3105
193. Ms. Beatrice R. Sharp,  
14 Goddard Street, Ulverstone 7315
194. Mr. P. Barnes,  
'Lincoln', 4 Ventnor Avenue,  
West Perth 6005
195. Mrs. Fay Bussell,  
710 Dorans Road, Sandford, 7020,
196. Mrs. A. M. Worsley,  
10 Winmarleigh Avenue,  
Taroona 7053
197. Mr. & Mrs. G. & S. Riddoch,  
349 Huon Road, South Hobart 7004
198. Mr. & Mrs. L. & P. Derrick,  
25 Calder Crescent,  
Blackmans Bay, 7052
199. Mr. C. Connor,  
4/8 Romilly Street,  
South Hobart 7004
200. Mrs. M. MacRae,  
46 Arthur Street, Launceston 7250
201. Mrs. E. B. Birch,  
PO Box 459, Queenstown 7467
202. Mr. B. Bennett,  
38 Bowen Avenue, Trevallyn 7250
203. Dr. Paul McGinity,  
PO Box 16, Scottsdale 7269
204. Mr. B. Westerbeek,  
26 Douglas Street,  
East Devonport, 7310
205. Mr. M. Beaumont,  
51 Robin Street, Newstead 7250
206. Mr. A. V. Graham,  
49 Robin Street, Launceston 7250
207. Mrs. I. Noga,  
190 Clarence Street, Howrah 7018,
208. Miss. A. M. Tagg,  
32 Hall Street, Ridgeway 7054,
209. Mrs. Marion Hunter,  
11 Kingston Heights,  
Kingston Beach, 7050
210. Mrs. I. Smith,  
PO Box 5, Scamander 7215,
211. Mr. & Mrs. J. Oosterloo,  
34 Barwing Crescent,  
Riverside 7250
212. Mr. L. Bush,  
34 Charlton Street, Norwood, 7250
213. Mrs. D. Hunter,  
3/6 Stoke Street, New Town 7008
214. Mr. M. R. Kingston,  
2/63 Main Street, Ulverstone 7315
215. Mr. D. Hodgson,  
59 Thompsons Lane, Newnham  
7250

216. Ms. P. Collett,  
60 Robin Street, Newstead 7250
217. Mr. D. Reekie,  
139 Emu Bay Road, Deloraine 7304
218. Mrs. D. Reekie,  
139 Emu Bay Road, Deloraine 7304
219. Dr. B. A. Smithurst,  
411 Main Road, Kangaroo Point  
Queensland 4169
220. Miss. J. C. Tagg,  
"Emoh Ruo"  
32 Hall Street, Ridgeway 7054
221. Ms. Betty Parsons,  
Secretary,  
Anglican Parish of Hamilton,  
"The Rectory", Hamilton 7140,
222. Mrs. D. P. Bishop,  
30 Kaoota Road, Rose Bay 7015
223. Mr. J. O'Connor,  
PO Box 1209, Clayton South 3169
224. Mr. C. Jamieson, emailed submission  
dated 12 June, 1997.
225. Ms. Lucinda Crofts,  
74 Bridge Street, Richmond 7025
226. Mrs. G. N. Baker,  
32 Heather Street,  
South Launceston 7249
227. Mrs. P. Haines,  
PO Box 105, Penguin 7316,
228. Mrs. K. Cox,  
5 Park Road, Lindisfarne 7015,
229. Mr. R. H. Horton,  
2 Dapple Street, Norwood 7250
230. Mrs. V. J. Street,  
2 Dapple Street, Norwood 7250
231. Ms. C. Eykelkamp,  
859 New Road, Kelso 7270
232. Mr. Chris Browning,  
Co-ordinator, TRUST,  
GPO Box 182B, Melbourne 3001
233. Dr. F.C.M. Schokman,  
438 Elizabeth Street, Hobart 7000
234. Mr. Tony Sturges,  
46 Katoomba Crescent, Rosetta 7010
235. Submission with 14 signatures, (only  
11 to be accounted for, undated,
- with enclosure from Ms. Adrienne Petch,  
no address.
236. Mrs. R. G. Fawcett,  
3/20 Glyndon Court, Norwood 7250
237. Miss. Lucia MacFarlane,  
3 York Street, Sandy Bay 7005
238. Mrs. P. McCann,  
12 Toorak Avenue,  
Lenah Valley 7008
239. Mrs. E. Sherrin,  
42 Kerria Road, Risdon Vale 7016,
240. Mr. P. R. Zeeman,  
52 Lyttleton Street,  
East Launceston 7250
241. Ms. J. Brooking,  
Secretary, St. Bernard's Parish,  
Box 51, Claremont 7011
242. Mr. P. D. Howard,  
President,  
Association of Catholic Parents, GPO  
Box 1411, Springwood, Qld 4127,
243. Mr. & Mrs. H. & E. Berger,  
7 Summerhill Road,  
West Hobart 7000
244. Ms. J. Willey,  
9 Kitchener Avenue,  
Beauty Point 7250
245. Mr. & Mrs. B. & S. Harding,  
22 Emma Street, Bridport 7262
246. Letter containing 83 signatures,  
undated.
247. Mr. H. Knudsen,  
17 Coffey Court, Binnalong Bay,  
St. Helens 7216
248. Mr. H. Kortekaas,  
18 Riverdale Grove,  
Launceston 7250
249. Mrs. L. Dooley,  
10 Newlands Avenue,  
Lenah Valley 7008
250. Miss. Margaret O'Keefe,  
5 Karoola Road, Lindisfarne 7015
251. Mr. B. D. Cox,  
5 Park Road, Lindisfarne 7015  
submission dated 12 June, 1997.
252. Dr. J. Markos,  
PO Box 289, Launceston 7250,
253. Mr. C. Mulder,

- 
- |      |  |      |  |
|------|--|------|--|
|      | 9a Dyball Street, Hadspen 7290,  |      | 203 Churchill Ave, Sandy Bay 7005  |
| 254. | Mr. & Mrs. G. & M. Price,<br>13 Corinna Road, Lindisfarne 7015                           | 275. | Dr. J. Gartlan,<br>5 Dynnyrne Road, Dynnyrne 7005                            |
| 255. | Sister Mary Stephanie,<br>Carmelite Monastery,<br>Cambridge Street, Launceston 7250      | 276. | Mr. J. Chambers,<br>27 Wyndella Street, Launceston<br>7250                   |
| 256. | Ms. J. Brown,<br>19 Wayne Avenue, Sandy Bay 7005   | 277. | Ms. B. Benseman,<br>129 West Tamar Road,<br>Riverside 7250                   |
| 257. | Ms. W. Smith,<br>5 Constance Avenue, Glenorchy 7010                                      | 278. | Mr. B. Van Galen,<br>99 Conway Street, Launceston 7250                       |
| 258. | Ms. M. J. Brufold,<br>1/37 Thorne Street, Burnie 7320,                                   | 279. | Mrs. B. Glover,<br>3560 Lyell Highway,<br>New Norfolk 7140                   |
| 259. | Ms. S. Kozuh,<br>2/6 Capri Drive, Sandy Bay 7005   | 280. | Signature unreadable,<br>38 Futuna Ave, Burnie 7320                          |
| 260. | Mr. & Mrs. J. & A. Butterworth,<br>12 Harrow Place, Tarooma 7053                         | 281. | Sister Andrew Carroll,<br>1 Davey Court, New Norfolk 7140                    |
| 261. | Ms. P. Lewis,<br>PO Box 308, Wynyard 7325,   | 282. | Sister Kathleen,<br>St. Joseph's Convent,<br>20 Thirza Street, New Town 7008 |
| 262. | Mr. N. Heckscher,<br>4/314 Park Street, New Town 7008                                    | 283. | Sister Maria Smith,<br>St. Paul's Parish,<br>PO Box 11, Oatlands 7120        |
| 263. | Ms. T. Cahill,<br>20 Thirza Street, New Town 7008  | 284. | Mr. D. M. Dowlman,<br>PO Box 300, St. Helens 7216                            |
| 264. | Mrs. M. Green,<br>14 York Street, Sandy Bay 7005   | 285. | Mrs. J. M. Dobson,<br>PO Box 92, St. Helens 7216,                            |
| 265. | Mrs. Amy Scoles,<br>2 Ewens Court, Glenorchy, 7010                                       | 286. | Mrs. O. Downey,<br>PO Box 119, Currie,<br>King Island 7256                   |
| 266. | Mr. & Mrs. E. Tague,<br>19 The Strand, George Town 7253                                  | 287. | Mr. J. Strawbridge,<br>1 Cheverton Parade, Sandy Bay 7005                    |
| 267. | Dr. G. Gartlan,<br>5 Dynnyrne Road, Dynnyrne 7005  | 288. | Mr. H. G. Hodge,<br>21 Coniston Place, Trevallyn 7250                        |
| 268. | Mr. R. W. Frost,<br>40 Charlton Street, Launceston 7250<br>Submission with 8 signatures. | 289. | Ms. H. Strong,<br>PO Box 222, Sorell 7172,                                   |
| 269. | Mr. H. Puli,<br>15 Wirilda Drive, Burnie 7320  | 290. | Mr. A. M. Young,<br>119 Abbotsfield Road,<br>Claremont 7011                  |
| 270. | Mr. H. Catchpole,<br>9 Mills Road, Burnie 7320   | 291. | Mr. D. V. Galligan QC,<br>46 Moore Street, Enoggera<br>Qld. 4051             |
| 271. | Mr. & Mrs. E. Reilly,<br>10 King Edward Street,<br>Ulverstone 7315                       | 292. | Dr. A. W. Hartwig,<br>Cnr. Creek & Stanley Rds.,<br>Carina East, QLD 4152    |
| 272. | Ms. P. W. Parker,<br>No address.   | 293. | Ms. Lucy Jackman,  |
| 273. | Mr. D. D. Lynch,<br>7 Evelyn Crescent, Sandy Bay 7005                                    |      |  |
| 274. | Mrs. N. Galea,   |      |  |
-



- unaddressed and undated.
294. Latrobe Christian Ministers' Fraternal, St. Luke's Rectory, PO Box 46, Latrobe 7307 (three signatories).
295. Mr. T. Imison, 33 West Barrack Street, Deloraine 7304
296. Mrs. A. M. Wieczorek, 22 Binya Street, Glenorchy 7010
297. Mr. M. G. Hudson, 9 Haven Crescent, Ulverstone 7315
298. Mrs. D. M. Hudson, 9 Haven Crescent, Ulverstone 7315
299. Mr. F. D. Morgan, 19 Elphinstone Road, Mount Stuart 7000
300. Mr. S. Mackrell, 6 Guilford Road, Riverside 7250
301. Mrs. C. Stanford, 386 Argyle Street, North Hobart 7000
302. Mr. B. Ortolan, 137 Springfield Avenue, West Moonah 7009
303. Mrs. P. McKay, 98 Nelson Road, Sandy Bay 7005
304. Ms. D. Carey, 59 Mace Street, Montello, Burnie 7320
305. Mr. W. Byrne, 2/170 Trevor Street, Ulverstone, 7315
306. Mr. K. Kirkpatrick, 8 Sassafra Court, Burnie 7320
307. Mr. J. Mahony, 202 Lenah Valley Road, Lenah Valley 7008
308. Mr. & Mrs. D. & P. Clark, Directors, The Jewish Centre, 93 Lord Street, Sandy Bay
309. Mr. J. J. McCarthy, 16 Kallaroo Road, Pialligo, ACT 2609
310. Dr. R. Kingston, 120 Augusta Road, Lenah Valley 7008
311. Dr. John Fleming, Director, Southern Cross Bioethics Institute, PO Box 206, Plympton, SA 5038,
312. Mr. J. Sertori, 80 Magnus Street, Nelson Bay, NSW 2315,
313. Dr. J. Philip, Palliative Care Clinician, 455 George Street, Fitzroy, VIC 3065.
314. Mr. T. O'Rourke, 1 Turners Beach Road, Turners Beach 7315
315. Mr. D. H. Ingrouille, 3 Maydena Place, Parklands, Burnie 7320
316. Mrs. P. M. Sharman, 175 Channel Highway, Tarooma 7053
317. Mrs. J. Dillon, 2 Maluka Street, Bellerive 7018,
318. Ms. K. L. Ross, 5 Oxford Crescent, Glenorchy 7010,
319. Ms. R. A. McAuley, 31 Esplanade, Swan Point 7275,
320. Mrs. M. Trus, Unit 37, 131 Hill Street, West Hobart 7000
321. Mr. R. D. McAuley, 31 Esplanade, Swan Point, 7275
322. Mr. M. B. Fleming, 7/5 Valley Street, Riverside 7250
323. Dr. D. Welch, 33 Lyttleton Street, Launceston 7250
324. Mr. J. E. Cochrane, 40 Bradshaw Street, Latrobe 7307
325. Ms. E. M. Ryan, PO Box 585, Queenstown 7467
326. Mrs. S. Brock, 6 Goulburn Street, St. Leonards 7250
327. Mrs. Jean Harley, 76 Lawrence Vale Road, South Launceston, plus one other signature.
328. Mr. H. M. de Jonge, 1 Stammers Place, Burnie 7320
329. No name, address: 12/17 Armitage Crescent,

- 
- Burnie 7320
330. Mr. J. Hocking,  
27 Crosby Road, Rosetta 7010,
331. Mrs. M. Triffett,  
263 Lenah Valley Road,  
Lenah Valley 7008
332. Ms. M. Hocking,  
27 Crosby Road, Rosetta, 7010
333. Mr. G. P. R. Hocking,  
27 Crosby Road, Rosetta 7010
334. Mrs. B. Morgan,  
1/122 King Street, Sandy Bay 7005
335. Ms. B. Judges,  
85 Benjamin Terrace,  
New Norfolk 7140
336. Mrs. D. Prestage,  
21 Trevor Terrace,  
New Norfolk, 7140
337. Mr. A. J. de Jongh,  
1 Stammers Place, Burnie 7320
338. Dr. J. H. Wilson,  
60 Golconda Road, Lilydale 7254,
339. Mr. M. Wisoky,  
C/- GPO Hobart, 7001
340. Mr. G. Dowling,  
22 Station Road, St. Leonards 7270
341. Mrs. Lorna Button,  
23 Beach Road, Currie,  
King Island 7256
342. Mr. K. J. M. Davison,  
RA 928 Mengha Road,  
Smithton 7330
343. Mrs. N. Lefevre,  
9 Kywong Crescent,  
Ulverstone 7315
344. Mrs. P. Barwick,  
26/19 Hamilton Street, West  
Hobart 7000
345. Mr. J. Miller,  
PO Box 41, Fingal 7214
346. Sister Mary Peter  
of the Trinity ODC (Sharp),  
Carmelite Monastery,  
Cambridge Street,  
Launceston 7250
347. Mr. W. G. Wisoky,  
C/- GPO Hobart 7001,
348. Mrs. J. Parker,  
25 James Street, Latrobe 7307,
349. Mr. A. A. Horton,  
PO Box 674, Launceston 7250
350. Mr. S. Higgins,  
3/41 Walden Street, Newstead 7250
351. The Right Reverend S. J. Nicholson,  
Moderator,  
Presbyterian Church of Tasmania,  
36 St. John Street, Launceston 7250
352. Mr. J. M. McGregor, AM,  
107 Quarter Sessions Road,  
Westleigh NSW 2120
353. Mr. J. Gunn, "Kuranui",  
Low Head 7253,
354. Dr. N. Muirden,  
10A Stroma Avenue,  
North Balwyn, Vic 3104
355. Senator Bob Brown,  
GPO Box 404, Hobart 7001,
356. Dr. J. N. Santamaria,  
PO Box 26, Red Hill South, Vic 3937
357. Mr. Ben Marris,  
President, Hospice Care Assoc.  
of Southern Tas. Inc.,  
17 Magnet Court, Sandy Bay, 7005
358. Dr. C. Hased,  
Senior Lecturer,  
Department of Community Medicine,  
Monash University,  
867 Centre Road,  
East Bentleigh, Vic. 3165
359. Mr. L. B. Heathorn,  
PO Box 8, Irishtown 7330,
360. Mr. I. Moncrieff,  
3 Sanderson Place, Burnie 7320
361. Mr. T. McKenna,  
42 Fairthorne Road, Trevallyn 7250
362. Mr. & Mrs. P. & J. Crouch,  
10 Beech Road, Norwood 7250
363. Miss. G. MacFarlane,  
3 York Street, Sandy Bay 7005
- 364 & 661 Ms. S. Goodwin,  
The Gawler Foundation,  
PO Box 775,  
Yarra Junction Vic 3797
365. Dr. J. R. Wilson,  
PO Box 692, Quoiba 7310
-

- 
366. Ms. R. Rowe,  
8 Downing Street, Riverside 7250
367. Dr. G. Flaherty,  
67 Hopkins Street, Moonah 7009
368. Mr. & Mrs. J. & K. Wielstra,  
14 Kipling Crescent, Hadspen 7290
369. Mrs. A. Brush,  
115 Nixon Street, Devonport 7310  
submission dated 23 June, 1997
370. Mrs. I. Bingham,  
Catholic Women's League (Tas.) Inc.,  
199 Flinders Street,  
Beauty Point 7270
371. Mrs. V. Neal,  
Parish Council Secretary,  
Anglican Parish of Leongatha 3953
372. Ms. L. Kay,  
21 Pauldon Drive, Sandy Bay 7005,
373. Mrs. L. Paulovics,  
177 Nelson Road,  
Mount Nelson 7007
374. Mrs. J. Tucker,  
21 York Street, Sandy Bay 7005
375. Mr. M. Van der Velde,  
153 South Esk Drive,  
Hadpsen 7250
376. Ms. B. Jarrett,  
16 Mirool Place, New Town 7008
377. Mr. T. E. Ward OAM,  
25 Bedford Street, New Town 7008
378. Mrs. L. Williams,  
31 Danina Street, Chigwell 7011
379. Ms. M. Mulholland,  
1/44 Redwood Rd., Kingston 7050
380. Sister L. Jarvis,  
20 Thirza Street, New Town 7008
381. Miss. Robin Wilkinson, AM,  
President, Tasmanians with  
Disabilities Inc.,  
1 St. Johns Avenue, New Town 7008
382. Dr. J. A. Gill,  
86 Hilton Street,  
Mount Waverley 3149
383. Mrs. Margaret Tighe,  
Chairwoman, Right to Life Australia,  
PO Box 782, Brunswick Lower 3056.
384. Dr. R. Schneider,  
Department of Psychiatry,  
PO Box 1963, Launceston 7250
385. Mr. Don Day, Chairman,  
Parish Council, Catholic Parish of  
Bellerive/Rokeby, 13 Myoora Street,  
Howrah 7018
386. Ms. S. Mitchell,  
204 Nelson Road,  
Mount Nelson 7007
387. Ms. L. Weatherly,  
188 Main Road, Austins Ferry 7011
388. Mr. R. W. Henning,  
111 Mount Rumney Road,  
Mount Rumney 7170
389. Mr. & Mrs. T. & R. Brun,  
6 Innaloo Street,  
Waverley, Launceston 7250
390. Mrs. S. Darby,  
1 Joynton Street, New Town 7008
391. Mrs. J. Lazaroff,  
5 Esplanade East, Coles Bay 7215
392. Mr. M. Loughhead,  
Hobart Heart Centre,  
67 Davey Street, Hobart
393. Mr. J. VanderRos,  
8 Negara Street, Norwood 7250,
394. Mr. T. Wisoky,  
124 Marlyn Road,  
South Hobart 7004
395. Ms. H. Kent,  
86 Cotton Street, Latrobe 7307,
396. Mr. & Mr. K. & J. Westcott,  
502 Main Road, Montrose 7010
397. Ms. C. Hocking,  
27 Crosby Road, Rosetta 7010
398. Mrs. L. Bromfield,  
87 Abbotsfield Road,  
Claremont 7011
399. Ms. M. Wallace-Parnell,  
RSD 720, Devonport 7310,
400. Mr. Chan Fuan Cheang,  
59A York Street, Sandy Bay 7005
401. Mrs. J. Letter,  
76 Meredith Crescent,  
South Launceston 7249
402. Mrs. P. F. Gartlan,  
4/10 Ellerslie Road,  
Battery Point 7004
-

- 
- |      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
| 403. | Miss M. Dunne,<br>13 Eady Street, Glenorchy 7010                            | 11 Girvan Ave, New Town 7008   |
| 404. | Miss D. L. Armstrong,<br>6 Kywong Crescent, Ulverstone 7315                 | 424. Ms. M. P. Ward,<br>31 Burnside Ave., New Town 7008                                  |
| 405. | Sister Mary Monica,<br>Carmelite Monastery,<br>Cambridge Street, Launceston | 425. Ms. M. Griggs,<br>PO Box 327, Sandy Bay, 7006                                       |
| 406. | Mr. G. F. Batchelor,<br>122 Genora Road, New Norfolk<br>7140                | 426. Mr. O. B. Dunne,<br>10 Pindos Drive, Tranmere 7018                                  |
| 407. | Mr. A. Hinds,<br>21 Florence Street, Moonah 7009,                           | 427. Mrs. J. Marsh,<br>17 McGough Street, Glenorchy 7010                                 |
| 408. | Ms. M. Laver,<br>247 West Tamar Road,<br>Launceston 7250                    | 428. Mr. L. Allen,<br>26 Gibbons Street, Wynyard 7325,                                   |
| 409. | Mr. B. Monks,<br>North Motton 7315  | 429. Mr. D. Lane,<br>54 Payne Street, Burnie 7320  |
| 410. | Ms. S. Pitt,<br>7 Bedford Street, New Town 7008,                            | 430. Mr. A. de Jonge,<br>30 Andrea Place, Launceston 7250                                |
| 411. | Ms. M. E. Galligan,<br>110 Montagu Street,<br>New Town 7008                 | 431. Mr. J. McKinnon,<br>4 Bulwer Street, Longford 7301                                  |
| 412. | Mr. E. Sims,<br>1/12 Vieste Drive, Glenorchy 7010                           | 432. Mr. S. Lenon,<br>emailed submission on 23 June,<br>1997, (slenonAida.tassie.net.au) |
| 413. | Mr. J. H. Spencer,<br>11 Corranga Drive, Chigwell 7011                      | 433. Mrs. M. Dixon,<br>20 Thirza Street, New Town 7008                                   |
| 414. | Mrs. M. Summers,<br>18 Seaview Avenue, Burnie 7320                          | 434. Ms. M. Parsissons,<br>91 Chapel Street, Glenorchy 7010                              |
| 415. | Mr. & Mrs. K. & M. Tidey,<br>2/87 Riverside Drive, Riverside 7250           | 435. Mr. M. Stone,<br>130 Wentworth Street,<br>South Hobart 7004                         |
| 416. | Mrs. M. Malone,<br>12 Oldham Avenue, New Town<br>7008                       | 436. Mr. K. A. Conner,<br>22 Pearsall Ave, Blackmans Bay 7052                            |
| 417. | Ms. D. Street,<br>31 Ruth Drive, Lenah Valley 7008,                         | 437. Ms. E. D. Brigg,<br>11 Illawong Cres, Tarooma 7053,                                 |
| 418. | Mr. T. Kroeze,<br>22 Pomona Road, Riverside 7250                            | 438. Mr. G. Fantini,<br>7 Douglas Street, New Town 7008                                  |
| 419. | Ms. A. Cole,<br>2 Anfield Street, Glenorchy, 7010                           | 439. Mr. D. Dressen,<br>207 Bakers Creek Road,<br>Lucaston 7109                          |
| 420. | Ms. B. Stone,<br>16 Minallo Ave, West Hobart 7000                           | 440. Mrs. I. P. Iles,<br>6 Devenish Drive, Sorell 7172,                                  |
| 421. | Mr. D. Stone,<br>16 Minallo Ave, West Hobart 7000                           | 441. Mr. A. L. Stephenson,<br>10 Broadwater Parade,<br>Sandy Bay 7005                    |
| 422. | Mrs. B. Taylor,<br>39 Catherine Street, Berriedale 7011                     | 442. Ms. G. Hardy,<br>PO Box 255, Geeveston 7116,  |
| 423. | Mr. A. G. Willemssen,   | 443. Sr. Marie Therese,<br>Carmelite Monastery, Cambridge<br>Street, Launceston 7250     |
-

- 
444. Mrs. J. Elliott,  
9 Seymour Street, Brighton 7030
445. Ms. M. A. Read,  
48 Highfield Street,  
West Moonah 7009
446. Ms. A. Ballbe,  
27 Red Chapel Ave, Sandy Bay 7005
447. Mrs. J. H. Jurasovic,  
822 South Arm Road,  
Sandford 7020
448. Ms. M. L. McMahon,  
4 King Street,  
Campbell Town 7210
449. Mr. H. P. Simco,  
8 Long Street, Penguin 7316
450. Mr. P. O. Kane,  
31/13 St. Canice Ave.,  
Sandy Bay 7005
451. Ms. M. M. Littlejohn,  
20 Thirza Street, New Town 7008
452. Mr. R. K. Flint,  
Rector, Anglican Parish of Sheffield  
22 Nightingale Ave., Sheffield 7306  
(plus 7 signatures)
453. Mr. P. R. Murray,  
PO Box 67, Newstead 7250,
454. Mr. D. P. H. O'Connor,  
91 Steele Street, Devonport 7310
455. Mrs. W. M. Kingston, OAM,  
2/16 Balmain Street,  
Glenorchy 7010
456. Mr. & Mrs. J. & B. Packham (no  
address supplied).
457. Mr. N. Ross,  
9 Canberra Road, Claremont 7011
458. Mrs. P. R. Rushton,  
35 Lord Street, Sandy Bay 7005
459. Mrs. L. Brereton,  
5 Pindo Drive, Trammere 7018
460. Mr. & Mrs. P. Cotterill,  
PO Box 291, Latrobe 7307
461. Mr. Rick Waters,  
38 Grinter Street,  
Riverside West 7250
462. Mrs. A. Hughes,  
171 Trammere Road, Howrah 7018
463. Ms. C. O'Dwyer,  
47 Merton Street, Glenorchy 7010
464. Mr. A. G. Purcell,  
1 Bland Street, Rokeby 7019
465. Ms. M. Regan, Carmelite Monastery,  
Cambridge Street, Launceston 7250,
466. Mr. K. H. Gleich,  
521 Quamby Brook, Deloraine 7304
467. Mrs. A. Zacharek,  
3/18 Auvergne Ave.,  
Lenah Valley 7008
468. Ms. N. O'Halloran,  
32 Douglas Street, New Town 7008
469. Sr. G. Dooley, Emmanuel Pastoral  
and Spirituality Centre,  
123 Abbott Street, Newstead 7250,
470. Ms. H. Morris,  
4/21 Jackson Street, Wynyard 7321
471. Miss. M. M. Lewis,  
13 David Street, Launceston 7250
472. Mrs. V. J. Rice,  
20 Tudor Ave., Newstead 7250,
472. Sr. Margaret Smith,  
Presentation Convent,  
57 Bourke Street, Launceston 7250,
473. Mrs. L. O'Halloran,  
9 John Street, Wynyard 7325,
474. Ms. E. Warburton,  
149 Elphin Road, Launceston 7250
475. Mrs. E. Carrabin,  
Paradise, Harlandrise Road,  
Sheffield 7305
476. Mrs. D. Peltzer,  
812 Pateena Road, Longford. 7301
478. Mr. & Mrs. E. & T. Muilenburg,  
4 Collins Street,  
South Launceston 7249
479. Ms. C. Gluich,  
521 Quamby Brook, Deloraine 7304
480. Mr. and Mrs. J.C. Oud,  
38 Winston Avenue,  
Seven Mile Beach 7170
481. Sister Mary Bernadette,  
15 McFarlane Street,  
South Hobart 7004
482. Mr. P. Halton,  
19 Fordham Street,
-

- 
- |      |  |      |  |
|------|--|------|--|
|      | Mount Stuart 7000  | 502. | Mrs. K. Cook,<br>20 Steeles Road,<br>Nicholls Rivulet 7112             |
| 483. | Mr. & Mrs. H. & M. Jones,<br>9A Girvan Avenue, New Town 7008                             | 503. | Mr. J. G. Byrne,<br>PO Box 201, Mary Street,<br>Cygnet 7112            |
| 484. | Mrs. A. Rigoli, 121 Molle Street,<br>West Hobart 7000,                                   | 504. | Mr. K. F. Iles,<br>6 Devenish Drive, Sorell 7172                       |
| 485. | Mr. M. W. Watson,<br>3 Cross Street, New Town 7008                                       | 505. | Ms. M. Virtue,<br>Emmanuel Centre, 123 Abbott Street<br>Newstead 7250  |
| 486. | Mr. S. Brush,<br>115 Nixon Street, Devonport 7310,                                       | 506. | Mr. K. Tighe,<br>43 Mirrimar Park,<br>Blackmans Bay 7052               |
| 487. | Mr. D. G. Couper,<br>5 Smith Street, Longford 7301,                                      | 507. | Mrs. C. E. McInnes,<br>Unit 24, 19 Hamilton Street<br>West Hobart 7000 |
| 488. | Mr. and Mrs. Y. Winden,<br>12 Peel Street,<br>South Launceston 7250                      | 508. | Ms. J. Jupe, (no address).   |
| 489. | Mr. Y. Johnston,<br>15 Hendriks Street, Ulverstone 7315                                  | 509. | Mrs. M. Knight,<br>10 Barunga Place, Glenorchy 7010                    |
| 490. | Sister Elizabeth Finn,<br>6 Buscombe Street, Bellerive 7015                              | 510. | Mr. A. S. Brigg,<br>11 Illawong Crescent, Tarooma 7053                 |
| 491. | Mr. G. L. Breen,<br>45 Centenary Crescent,<br>Claremont 7011                             | 511. | Mr. J. J. M. Kelly,<br>13 Carinya Street,<br>Blackmans Bay 7052        |
| 492. | Ms. M. Isham,<br>115 Upper Van Morey Road,<br>Margate 7054                               | 512. | Mr. F. Ortolan,<br>137 Springfield Avenue,<br>West Moonah 7009         |
| 493. | Miss D. Chandler,<br>4/51 Lincoln Street,<br>Lindisfarne 7015                            | 513. | Mrs. J. Newell,<br>8 Lawley Crescent,<br>South Hobart 7004             |
| 494. | Mr. J. Medwin,<br>Catholic Parish of Bellerive & Rokeby<br>2 Alma Street, Bellerive 7018 | 514. | Ms. J. Hocking,<br>27 Crosby Road, Rosetta 7010,                       |
| 495. | Ms. J. Russell,<br>16 Merton Street, Glenorchy 7010                                      | 515. | Mr. & Mrs. F. & D. Streetland,<br>Saunders Drive, Hadspen 7290         |
| 496. | Miss M. M. Finnigan,<br>7 Kullindi Court, Bellerive 7018                                 | 516. | Mrs. M. Johnson,<br>6 Cleary Place, Brighton 7030,                     |
| 497. | Mrs. A. M. Derrick,<br>104 Toffolis Road, Claremont 7011                                 | 517. | Mr. & Mrs. R. Walsh,<br>21 Tilyard Street, Montrose 7010               |
| 498. | Mr. J. C. Higgins,<br>33 Ripley Road, Moonah 7009  | 518. | Ms. J. Hooper,<br>2/49 O'Brien Street, Glenorchy 7010                  |
| 499. | Mrs. A. Johnston,<br>1737 Greens Beach Road,<br>Greens Beach 7270                        | 519. | Ms. A. Osuchowski,<br>3 Sherbourne Ave, West Hobart<br>7000            |
| 500. | Ms. M. Cleary,<br>PO Box 4, Beaconsfield 7270,   | 520. | Misses. H. & H. Collyer,<br>6 Lawley Crescent, Cascades 7000           |
| 501. | Ms. B. Morgan,<br>19 Elphinstone Road,<br>Mount Stuart 7000                              | 521. | Ms. I. Bingham,  |
-

- 199 Flinders Street,  
Beauty Point 7270
522. Mr. T. E. A. Iwaszek,  
2/21 Corinda Grove,  
West Moonah 7009
523. No name,  
49 High Street, Oatlands 7120,
524. Mrs. P. Bell,  
PO Box 348, Wynyard 7325,
525. Ms. H. S. Johnston,  
PO Box 154, Wynyard 7325,
526. Mr. P. J. Clark,  
547 Midland Highway,  
Brighton 7030
527. Ms. C. Ross,  
9 Canberra Road, Claremont 7011
528. Mr. K. Haley,  
5 Lissadell Court, New Town 7008
529. Ms. S. Parker,  
PO Box 4, Fingal 7214
530. Ms. M. Toohey,  
2 Wakehurst Road,  
Austins Ferry 7011
531. Ms. J. Munthe,  
30/100 Channel Highway,  
Taroona 7053
532. Mr. K. Kean (no address).
533. Ms. D. Willicombe,  
2 Wakehorse Road,  
Austins Ferry 7011
534. Mr. M. Donnelly,  
25 Clare Street, New Town 7008
535. Mrs. B. Roberts OAM,  
11 Sharps Road,  
Lenah Valley 7008
536. Dr. B. Pollard,  
40 Chisholm Street,  
Greenwich, NSW 2065
537. Ms. K. Clark,  
38 Croydon Road, Surrey Hills 3127,
538. Dr. A. Fisher,  
Australian Catholic University,  
Mercy Campus,  
412 Alexander Road,  
Ascot Vale 3032,
539. Mrs. M. Hewitt,  
144 Bally Park Road,  
Dodges Ferry 7173
540. Mr. D. Fitzgerald,  
2/84 Clare Street, New Town 7008
541. Mr. J. Bleazby,  
7/6 Altna-Craig Ave.,  
Lenah Valley 7008
542. Ms. C. G. Fahey, AM,  
18 Toorak Ave, Lenah Valley 7008
543. Mrs. J. H. Cummins,  
1/27 Lanena Street, Bellerive 7018
544. Ms. M. Morgan,  
50 Blowhole Road,  
Blackmans Bay 7052
545. Dr. J. Kantvilas,  
14 Rayment Terrace, Mt. Stuart  
7000
546. Ms. C. Heys,  
64 Elphin Road, Launceston, 7250
547. Mr. Foley,  
83 Cherry Road,  
Riverside West 7250
548. Mr. K. L. Illingworth,  
12 Birch Ave., Launceston 7250
549. Mrs. G. Fraser,  
120 Canopus Road, Cambridge 7170
550. Mr. A. D. Prisk,  
9 Marshalls Lane,  
Macquarie Plains 7140
551. Mr. R. R. Maloney,  
6 Goodhart Place, Sandy Bay 7005
552. Mr. K. Duffy,  
8 Caswell Street, Mowbray, 7248
553. Ms. Gwen .....,  
2/1 Dooleys Ave, Berriedale 7011
554. Ms. P. Wisby,  
40 Centenary Crescent,  
Claremont 7011
555. Ms. G. Byrne,  
PO Box 201, Cygnet 7112,
556. Mr. K. Morgan,  
314 Davey Street, Hobart 7004
557. Mr. C. Wood,  
129 The Cross Road, Crabtree 7109,
558. Mr. D. M. Phillips,  
33 Ripley Road, West Moonah 7009
559. Mr. & Mrs. K. & P. Rasmussen,  
89 Derwent Avenue

- Lindisfarne 7015 3 Giblin Street, Lenah Valley 7008
560. Miss V. J. Fisher,  
RMB 41 Main Road, Parattah 7120 579. Mr. E. J. Miller,  
18 Victory Place, Rokeby 7019
561. Ms. A. Wiezcorek, Chairperson,  
St. John's and St. Monica's Catholic  
Parish, PO Box 41, Glenorchy 7010  
(plus 12 signatures) 580. Mrs. R. Buchan,  
PO Box 249, New Norfolk 7140
562. Mr. D. Pittaway,  
193 St. John Street, Launceston 7250 581. Mrs. I. Cox,  
16 Ogilvie Lane, Richmond 7025
563. Mrs. T. Jacobs,  
7 Mt. Stuart Drive, Newnham 7248 582. Mr. P. H. Cook,  
24 Bambra Street, Lauderdale 7021
564. Mrs. D. Oliver,  
18 Sunnyside Road, Lindisfarne 7015 583. Mr. M. W. Walsh,  
2A Cedar Street, Lindisfarne 7015
565. Mrs. C. Williams,  
1/11 Upper Grant Street,  
Smithton 7330 584. Mr. J. Priest,  
135 Roslyn Avenue,  
Blackmans Bay 7052
566. Ms. H. O'Brien,  
22 Stephen Street,  
East Devonport 7310 585. Anch. Sr. Elizabeth-Julian Green,  
D.C., The Anchorhold  
PO Box 80, St. Leonards 7250,
567. Prof. P. J. Ravenscroft,  
Department of Palliative Care,  
Newcastle Mater Hospital,  
Locked Bag 7, Hunter Regional Mail  
Centre, NSW 2310 586. Ms. C. Fallon,  
20 Thirza Street, New Town 7008
568. Ms. O. Smith,  
22A Elliott Road, Glenorchy 7010 587. Mrs. R. Habgood,  
41 Mary Street, Launceston 7250
569. Dr. T. S. Kirkland,  
174 Macquarie Street, Hobart 7000 588. Ms. M. McCormack,  
Unit 20 - 12, Retirement Village  
Prospect 7250
570. Mr. J. Hodgkinson,  
11 Summerhill Road,  
West Hobart 7000 589. Mr. & Mrs. G. & N. McNamara,  
39 Lovett Street, Ulverstone 7315
571. Mrs. S. Grace,  
4 Jewel Drive, Blackmans Bay 7052 590. Mrs. K. A. Bourke,  
2 Hingston Place,  
Ulverstone 7315
572. Ms. M. L. Clark,  
20 Thirza Street, New Town 7008 591. Ms. M. M. Doherty,  
St. Leonards, Launceston 7250,
573. Mr. L. C. Saunders,  
73 Esplanade, Rose Bay 7015 592. Mrs. H. Antel,  
58 Dion Crescent, Launceston 7250
574. Mrs. A. Chisholm,  
18 Harding Street, New Town 7008 593. Ms. S. Antel,  
58 Dion Crescent, Riverside 7250
575. Mr. B. J. Breen,  
3 Edge Ave., Lenah Valley 7008 594. Ms. Sylvia Tyson,  
11 Veronica Cres., Launceston 7250
576. Ms. P. Styles,  
4/5A Marys Hope Road, Rosetta 7010 595. Mr. W. Tyson,  
11 Veronica Cres., Launceston 7250
577. Mr. & Mrs. E. & M. Bugg,  
14 Auvergne Ave,  
Lenah Valley, 7008 596. Mr. D. Kiely,  
29 Bain Terrace, Trevallyn 7250,
578. Mr. Y Engster, 597. Ms. N. Donnelly,  
74 Carlton Beach Road,  
Dodges Ferry 7173
598. Mrs. J. Miller,



- 
- |      |  |      |   |
|------|--|------|---|
|      | 18 Vicary Place, Rokeby 7019                                 |      | Glen Huon Road, Huonville 7109  |
| 599. | Mr. M. Green,<br>14 York Street, Sandy Bay 7005              | 620. | Dr. G. Toohill,<br>Private Bag 10, Leongatha 3953   |
| 600. | Fr. M. Delaney,<br>PO Box 8, New Norfolk 7140                | 621. | Mrs. V. Graham,<br>3/12 Vieste Drive, Glenorchy 7010  |
| 601. | Ms. J. Pullen,<br>3 Chapman Street, Bellerive 7018           | 622. | Mrs. M. Reschke,<br>16 Rowella Road, Sidmouth 7270  |
| 602. | Mr. E. Healy,<br>57 Bourke Street, Launceston 7250           | 623. | Mr. D. Smeaton,<br>Railton 7305   |
| 603. | Ms. M. Momente,<br>5 Eddie Street, Invermay 7248             | 624. | Mr. E. J. Morgan,<br>12 Swinton Place, Rose Bay 7015  |
| 604. | Mrs. P. Duffy,<br>8 Caswell Street, Launceston 7250          | 625. | Mrs. M. Simpson,<br>14 Mercer Street, New Town 7008   |
| 605. | Mr. P. McRae,<br>23 Stephensdale Drive,<br>Launceston 7250   | 626. | Mr. G. Brouwer,<br>29 Denis Drive, Riverside 7250   |
| 606. | Mrs. M. F. Cleaver,<br>"Lochfoyne", Avoca, 7213              | 627. | Mr. M. McManus,<br>16 St. Helens Street, Lindisfarne<br>7015  |
| 607. | Mrs. K. C. Mahoney,<br>14 Crockers Street, Railton 7305      | 628. | Mr. W. E. Tabart,<br>83 Corinth Street, Howrah, 7018  |
| 608. | Mr. P. C. Comas,<br>73 Lincoln Street, Lindisfarne 7015      | 629. | Ms. S. M. Sexton,<br>10 Michael Street,<br>West Launceston 7250                                       |
| 609. | Ms. K. Feldt,<br>17 Alford Street, Howrah 7018               | 630. | Ms. J. Dunne,<br>10 Pindos Drive, Tranmere, 7018  |
| 610. | Mrs. K. Grainger,<br>7/107 Tolosa Street, Glenorchy 7010     | 631. | Mr. R. Peterson,<br>79 Acton Road, Lauderdale 7021  |
| 611. | Mr. A. J. Wiss,<br>46 Begonia Street, Lindisfarne 7015       | 632. | Ms. P. Heseltine,<br>1/5 Montgomery Court,<br>Sandy Bay 7005  |
| 612. | Mrs. L. Holloway,<br>14 Barana Street, Mornington 7018       | 633. | Mrs. B. A. Lancaster,<br>All Saints Anglican Ladies Guild,<br>PO Box 119, Currie,<br>King Island 7256 |
| 613. | Mrs. S. M. Mackey, 61 Giblin Street,<br>Lenah Valley 7008    | 634. | Mrs. T. Lewinski,<br>13 BoaVista Road, New Town 7008  |
| 614. | Ms. B. Thomas,<br>110 Randalls Bay Road, Cygnet 7112         | 635. | Sister Brigid Barry,<br>Holy Trinity Convent,<br>Westbury 7303  |
| 615. | Ms. C. Mills,<br>27 Esplanade, Cygnet, 7112                  | 636. | Mr. L. L. Blyth,<br>38 Station Road, St. Leonards 7250  |
| 616. | Miss G. Thomas,<br>6904 Channel Highway, Cygnet<br>7112      | 637. | Mr. J. B. Shelverton,<br>27 Kunama Drive,<br>Kingston Beach 7050                                      |
| 617. | Mr. G. J. McKew,<br>40 Skiddaw Crescent,<br>Warrnambool 3280 | 638. | Mrs. N. B. Reynolds,<br>24 Barrett Street, Glenorchy 7010   |
| 618. | Ms. D. Wood,<br>129 Cross Road, Crabtree 7109,               |      |   |
| 619. | Mrs. E. Sarne,   |      |   |
-

639. Mr. R. C. Franssen, "Little Flower",  
17 Main Road, Exeter 7275
640. Ms. P. Ahearn,  
2 Olive Street, Launceston 7250
641. Br. H. Sharpe,  
Christian Brothers' Community,  
33 Ripley Road, West Moonah 7009
642. Ms. Sheila Lacey, Nazareth House,  
Station Road, St. Leonards
643. Ms. T. F. Durkin,  
30 Birch Ave, Newstead  
and Ms. P. M. Dawson,  
55 Hart Street, Newstead 7250,
644. Mr. F. J. Boland,  
38 Station Road, St. Leonards 7250
645. Sister Clare Breen, Nazareth House,  
St. Leonards 7250
646. Ms. P. Rennie,  
25 Balamara Street, Bellerive 7015
647. Ms. M. Ward,  
16 Canning Street, Launceston 7250
648. Mr. & Mrs. B. & I. Eilander,  
23 Harley Parade, Prospect 7250
649. Mr. M. Kerslake,  
9 Ascot Avenue, Sandy Bay 7005
650. Mr. W. Booth,  
33 Silwood Avenue, Howrah 7018
651. Ms. M. O'Connor, Director,  
Caritas Christi & Order of  
Malta Hospice Home Care Services,  
PO Box 2036, Kew 3101
652. Ms. L. McGee,  
89 Lawrence Vale Road,  
Launceston 7249
653. Mrs. M. Adams,  
73 Tasman Highway, Waverley 7250
654. Mr. P. J. Flanagan, Manager,  
& 786. Mary's Grange, Grange Avenue,  
Taroona 7053
655. Ms. E. Meers,  
5 Bellhaven Ave, Taroona 7053
656. Fr. Greg Barker, St. Johns Church,  
62 Bowden Street Glenorchy 7010
657. Mr. G. A. Clark,  
6 Botany Place, Austins Ferry 7011
658. Ms. A. Allanby,  
RMB 3049, Kellevie (via Sorell) 7176
- (Plus 8 signatories)
659. Sister Mary Teresa of Jesus,  
Carmelite Monastery  
Cambridge Street, Launceston 7250
660. Ms. B. McIntyre,  
Unit 2, Cherry Lane,  
57 Cadbury Road, Claremont, 7011
661. Dr. D. Gawler,  
177 Buckley Street, Essendon 3040,
662. Mr. G. Hinds,  
3 Glenmore Street, Rosetta 7010
663. Ms. R. Heys,  
5 West Park Drive, Launceston 7250
664. Mrs. M. Roper,  
11 Gonyah St., Howrah 7018
665. Ms. K. Linegar, Chairperson,  
Tasmanian Chapter, Royal College of  
Nursing, PO Box 350,  
Launceston 7250
666. Mr. J. Phillips, Secretary,  
St. Peter's Anglican Church,  
PO Box 725, Sandy Bay 7005,
667. Mr. A. W. Jansz,  
1 Cumberland Street,  
Eaglemont 3084
668. Mr. A. Ricker, Director,  
Health Television Network,  
PO Box 617, St. Ives, NSW 2057  
(Plus Video)
669. Mr. M. Clark,  
1 Hilden Street, New Town 7008
670. Mrs. M. Dance,  
5/10 Kensington Street,  
Glenorchy 7010
671. Mr. G. Eugster,  
3A Giblin Street, Lenah Valley 7008
672. Ms. E. Yates,  
130 Nelson Road, Mt. Nelson 7007
673. Mrs. A. Van Asperen,  
258 St. Leonards Road,  
Launceston 7250.
674. Mrs. B. M. Hickey,  
Arve Road, Geeveston 7116
675. Ms. M. Burgess,  
57 Bourke Street, Launceston 7250
676. Ms. B. M. Spitzer, 'Natone',  
32 Grosvenor Street, Sandy Bay 7005

- 
- |      |   |      |  |
|------|---|------|--|
| 677. | Mr. W. J. Thornton, Nazareth House,<br>St. Leonards 7250                              | 696. | Mr. B. D'Andreo,<br>10A Thirza Street, New Town 7008                       |
| 678. | Rev. E. M. Webber,<br>1 Hean Street, South Hobart 7004                                | 697. | Mr. C. W. Coad,<br>11 Burgess Avenue, Moonah 7009                          |
| 679. | Ms. B. O'Rourke,<br>1 Julia Cres., Ulverstone 7315                                    | 698. | Ms. S. McKenzie,<br>446 Deviot Road, Deviot 7275,                          |
| 680. | Ms. M. Doran,<br>15 East Derwent Highway,<br>Rose Bay 7015                            | 699. | Mr. A. J. O'Rourke,<br>1 Julia Crescent, Ulverstone 7315                   |
| 681. | Mr. L. Kiely,<br>17 Nelumie Road, Lindisfarne 7015,                                   | 700. | Mr. T. L. Hickey,<br>Arve Road, Geeveston 7116                             |
| 682. | Mr. H. R. Gregg,<br>2/73 Maluka Terrace, Bellerive<br>7018                            | 701. | Mr. E. J. Kremzer,<br>3 Renmark Place, Acton 7170                          |
| 683. | Ms. M. Iles,<br>55 Main Road, Sorell 7172   | 702. | Ms. H. Wiss,<br>46 Begonia Street, Lindisfarne 7015                        |
| 684. | Mr. N. Rickard, Unit 63,<br>2 Guy Street, Kings Meadows 7250<br>(plus 8 signatories)  | 703. | Ms. B. Richards,<br>12 Bradshaw Street, Latrobe 7307                       |
| 685. | Mr. J. Dwyer,<br>6 Whitford Street, Burnie 7320                                       | 704. | Mr. R. Richards,<br>12 Bradshaw Street, Latrobe 7307                       |
| 686. | Mrs. A. Stevenson,<br>PO Box 46, Evandale 7212  | 705. | Mrs. E. M. Gard,<br>234 Churchill Ave, Sandy Bay 7005                      |
| 687. | Mr. & Mrs. C. & J. Price,<br>6/194 Clarence Street, Howrah<br>7018                    | 706. | Mrs. M. Mazengarb,<br>8 Hildern Street, New Town 7008                      |
| 688. | Mr. & Mrs. M. & J. Huxley,<br>1 Croydon Avenue, Montrose 7010                         | 707. | Mr. E. P. Johnston,<br>1737 Greens Beach Road,<br>Greens Beach 7270        |
| 689. | Mr. B. R. Palmer,<br>71 Lindhill Avenue, Lindisfarne<br>7015                          | 708. | Ms. E. Morgan,<br>12 Swinton Place, Rose Bay 7015                          |
| 690. | Ms. J. R. McShane,<br>Little Company of Mary,<br>8 Joynton Street, Lenah Valley 7008, | 709. | Mr. A. J. Palmer,<br>71 Lindhill Ave., Lindisfarne 7015                    |
| 691. | Mr. G. Denehey,<br>13 Maweena Place, Kingston 7050                                    | 710. | Mr. F. Kaja,<br>190 Marys Hope Road,<br>Berriedale 7011                    |
| 692. | Mr. G. G. Farrington,<br>29 Topham Street, Rose Bay 7015                              | 711. | Miss M. Williams,<br>1/85 Nelson Street, Smithton 7330                     |
| 693. | Ms. J. Spoelstra,<br>155 Channel Highway,<br>Kingston 7050                            | 712. | Miss R. Stewart, Carmelite Monastery,<br>Cambridge Street, Launceston 7250 |
| 694. | Mr. A. G. O'Rourke,<br>Unit 1, 52 Bay Road,<br>New Town 7008                          | 713. | Sr. Maria, Carmelite Monastery,<br>Cambridge Street, Launceston 7250       |
| 695. | Ms. E. Uzeallo,<br>2/13 Croesus Court,<br>Lindisfarne 7015                            | 714. | Mr. J. J. Yates,<br>130 Nelson Road,<br>Mount Nelson 7007                  |
|      |   | 715. | Ms. J. E. Laver,<br>3 Glenelg Street,<br>Campbell Town 7210,               |
|      |   | 716. | Ms. J. Robertson,<br>41 Melbourne Street,                                  |
-

- Triabunna 7190
717. Mr. & Mrs. R. A. Kuipers,  
PO Box 317, St. Helens 7216
718. Mr. F. M. Ransley,  
15 Pedder Street, New Town 7008
719. Ms. L. M. Bell,  
69 Illawarra Road,  
Blackmans Bay 7052
720. Ms. P. Traynor,  
21 Princes Street, Sandy Bay 7005
721. Mr. W. N. Smith,  
30 Edge Avenue, Lenah Valley 7008
722. Mrs. M. Smith,  
30 Edge Avenue, Lenah Valley 7008
723. Mr. G. Schumann,  
19 Normanby Street, Oakleigh 3166
724. Mr. M. C. Fantini,  
7 Douglas Street, New Town 7008
725. Mr. Daryl .....,  
A.A. Lord Homes, Block 2, 15/131  
Hill Street, West Hobart 7000,
726. Mr. L. E. Cafe,  
2/47 McKellar Road, Newstead 7250
727. Mrs. M. Bullock,  
4 Main Street, St. Marys 7215
728. Mr. G. Peterson,  
49 Kenton Road, Geilston Bay 7015
729. Ms. M. Wallace,  
251 Acton Drive, Acton 7170
730. Ms. J. Tidey,  
31 Haig Street,  
Mowbray Heights 7248
731. Ms. B. Slad,  
4/23 Vieste Drive, Glenorchy 7010
732. Ms. E. A. Curtan,  
50 Blowhole Road,  
Blackmans Bay 7052
733. Mrs. W. Veltkamp,  
30 Fulton Street, Legana 7277
734. Mr. P. J. Knight,  
22 Akuna Street, Montagu Bay 7018
735. Mr. K. Aherne,  
3/155 Tolosa Street, Glenorchy 7010
736. Ms. M. O'Brien,  
PO Box 108, Bridgewater 7030
737. Mrs. J. McKay,  
35/53 Kensington Street,  
New Norfolk 7140.
738. Mrs. L. T. Brazendale,  
4/124 Hopkins Street, Moonah 7009
739. Ms. R. Gleeson,  
PO Box 266, Mowbray 7248,
740. Miss. & Mrs. R. & J. Wagenaar,  
16 Orana Place, Riverside 7250
741. Mr. P. Cooper,  
142 Elphin Road, Launceston 7250
742. Mrs. J. Lewis,  
139 Cambridge Street,  
Launceston 7250
743. Mr. P. Griffin,  
7 Teal Court, Newnham 7248,
744. Mrs. B. Pardoe,  
19 Lewan Ave, Kingston 7050
745. Ms. T. Stuart,  
29 Riverdale Grove, Newstead 7250
746. Sister Mary Immaculate,  
Carmelite Monastery,  
Cambridge Street, Launceston 7250
747. Mrs. M. Masters,  
Nazareth House, St. Leonards 7250
748. Mr. M. Clynes,  
368 West Tamar Road,  
Riverside 7250
749. Mr. M. M. Dillon,  
20 Thirza Street, New Town 7008
750. Mr. D. Vauten,  
PO Box 415, Launceston 7250
751. Ms. S. Traynor,  
6 Lasswade Avenue, Dynnyrne 7005
752. Mrs. I. Siewruk,  
40 Parua Road, Newnham, 7250
753. Ms. I. Eccles,  
Carmel Cottage, Carmelite  
Monastery  
Cambridge Street, Launceston 7250
754. Ms. M. J. Aiken,  
123 Abbott St., Newstead 7250
755. Ms. M. C. O'Keefe,  
38 Station Street, St. Leonards 7250
756. Mrs. M. A. Whelan,  
51 Mt. Leslie Road, Prospect 7250

- 
757. Rev. Fr. J. Nagle,  
Sacred Heart Presbytery,  
46 Campbell Street, Newstead 7250
758. Ms. L. L. Green,  
13 Battery Square,  
Battery Point 7004
759. Miss P. Smallbone,  
2/34 Pedder Street, New Town 7008
760. Ms. M. A. Cook,  
19 Pirie Street, New Town 7008
761. Mr. J. G. Cook,  
19 Pirie Street, New Town 7008
762. Bellerive Parish Action Group,  
C/- 2 Alma Street, Bellerive 7018  
(11 signatories)
763. Ms. S. Donaghue,  
101 Otago Bay Road,  
Otago Bay 7017
764. Mr. C. Watts,  
60 Mount Stuart Road,  
Mount Stuart 7000
765. Mr. W. Southerwood,  
Eastern Shore Minister's Association,  
PO Box 79, Lindisfarne 7015,  
(Plus 7 signatories)
766. Sister Mary Aitkin,  
Carmelite Monastery,  
Cambridge Street, Launceston 7250
767. Mrs. L. A. Hutchison OAM,  
45 Diamond Drive,  
Blackmans Bay 7052
768. Mr. L. B. Durno,  
16 Esplanade, Lindisfarne 7015
769. Mrs. S. Durno,  
16 Esplanade, Lindisfarne, 7015
770. Mr. J. Ward,  
PO Box 1002, Sandy Bay 7005
771. Mr. Chief Justice Cox,  
Chief Justice's Chambers,  
Hobart 7000
772. Ms. Helen Kiely,  
29 Bain Terrace, Trevallyn 7250
773. Ms. M. Benson,  
65 Mooreville Road, Burnie 7320
774. Mr. S. Lumsden,  
Senior Minister,  
St. Helens Christian Fellowship,  
PO Box 248, St. Helens 7216
775. Ms. C. Priest,  
51 Hudson Cres, West Moonah 7009
776. Dr. D. R. MacKay,  
24 King Street, Bellerive 7018,
777. Fr. John Flader,  
Catholic Chaplain,  
University of Tasmania,  
GPO Box 252C, Hobart 7001,
778. Mr. R. Korkmaz,  
40 Ruth Drive, Lenah Valley 7008  
(plus 2 signatories)
779. Mr. J. G. Aitken,  
17 Sixth Ave, New Norfolk 7140
780. Ms. H. Gray, Branch Secretary,  
Australian Nursing Federation (Tas.  
Branch), On behalf of the Australian  
Assoc. of Hospice and Palliative Care,  
182 Macquarie Street, Hobart 7000
781. C.R. & P. M. Hulse,  
Ellenbrook, Glengarry, 7275
782. Ms. J. Duffin (no address),
783. Ms. S. R. Tyrrett,  
25 Wattle Place, Burnie 7320,
784. Mr. & Mrs. D. & C. Van Galen,  
21 Clark Street, Launceston 7248
785. Mrs. Y. Maher,  
3/124A North Fenton Street,  
Devonport 7310
786. Mr. P. J. Flanagan,  
Manager, Mary's Grange  
Incorporated, Grange Ave.,  
Taroona 7053
787. Mrs. R. Symons,  
39 Guilford Road, Riverside 7250
788. Mr. J. V. Fisher,  
51 Clare Street, New Town 7008
789. Ms. D. Oakley,  
80 Gepp Parade, Glenorchy 7010
790. Ms. Helen Gray, State Secretary,  
Australian Nursing Federation  
(Tas. Branch), 182 Macquarie Street,  
Hobart 7000
791. Mrs. A. Reynolds,  
3 Hendricks Street, Ulverstone 7315
792. Ms. C. Cunningham,  
45 Hobart Road, New Norfolk 7140
793. Ms. A. Kelleher,  
27 Toorak Ave, Lenah Valley 7008
-

- 
- 8 Thirza Street, New Town 7008
794. Mrs. J. Redeker, 33 Mathinna Road,  
Oyster Cove 7150
795. Mrs. M. Kirkman,  
29 Bayfield Street, Bellerive 7018
796. A/Prof. J. N. Lickiss,  
Director of Palliative Care,  
Royal Prince Alfred Hospital,  
Missenden Road,  
Camperdown NSW 2050
797. Prof. T. Cramond,  
Director, Multidisciplinary Pain  
Centre, Royal Brisbane Hospital,  
Herston Road, Brisbane 4029
798. Dr. R. Partiger,  
173 Macquarie Street, Hobart 7000
799. Dr. G. J. Gartlan,  
4/10 Ellerslie Road, Battery Point  
7004
800. Ms. S. A. S. Short,  
Hobart District Nursing Service Inc.,  
16 Farley Street, Glenorchy 7010
801. Mr. & Mrs. T. & E. Young,  
45 Hestercombe Road,  
Granton 7011
802. Mr. P. Douglas,  
Principal, Our Lady of Mercy School  
22 West Goderich Street,  
Deloraine 7304,
803. Mr. V. Siewruk,  
40 Parua Road, Newnham 7248
804. Mr. E. Higgins,  
Oakington, Tea Tree 7017
805. Mr. R. J. Reynolds,  
3 Hendricks Street, Ulverstone 7315
806. Mrs. S. Nugent,  
17 Corinna Road, Lindisfarne 7015
807. Mrs. J. Robtson,  
140 Nelson Road, Mt. Nelson 7007
808. Ms. L. Cox,  
PO Box 716, Devonport 7310
809. Ms. J. McLean,  
6 Lindsay Parade, St. Helens 7216
810. Mrs. J. Geary,  
8 Blair Street, Richmond 7025
811. Mr. T. J. Courto,  
8 Spinifex Road, Risdon Vale 7016
812. Mr. & Mrs. K. & K. Swan,
813. Ms. M. Bennett,  
260 Glen Huon Road,  
Huonville 7109
814. Mr. & Mrs. K. & D. Kay,  
South Road, Lileah, RA 1020  
Smithton 7330
815. Mrs. B. Watson,  
3 Botany Place, Austins Ferry 7011
816. Ms. C. Pecnik,  
60 Bayfield Road, Lauderdale 7021
817. Fr. Graeme Howard,  
Catholic Presbytery, Franklin 7113
818. Mr. Y. Sheehan,  
23 Carlton Street, New Town 7008
819. Ms. F. Groombridge,  
Lawless Road, Margate 7054
820. Ms. V. Chandler,  
"Skelwith", 95 Gully Road,  
Collinsvale 7012
821. Mr. S. Raspin,  
20 Robert Street, Triabunna 7190
822. Mrs. T. Oliver,  
1 Malabar Street, Launceston 7250
823. Mrs. H. Rollins,  
64 Red Chapel Ave, Sandy Bay 7005
824. Mr. S. Paulovics,  
177 Nelson Road,  
Mount Nelson 7007
825. Ms. M. Waldie,  
30 Tullamore Road, Orielton 7172
826. Mr. & Mrs. A. & L. Parr,  
2 Douglas Street, New Town 7008
827. Ms. L. C. Apted,  
58A Coleman Street,  
West Moonah 7009
828. Ms. Y. Eagling,  
44 Bonella Street, Ravenswood 7250
829. Ms. L. Hutchison,  
22 Clarence Street, Launceston 7250
830. Ms. L. Wright,  
38 Station Road, St. Leonards 7250
831. Mr. D. L. Hobbs,  
59 Rannock Ave., Riverside 7250
832. Mrs. E. Drake,  
9 Barunga Place, Glenorchy 7010
-

- 
- |      |   |      |   |
|------|---|------|---|
| 833. | Sister Patricia Hilton,<br>Nazareth House, St. Leonards 7250      | 852. | Mr. F. C. Smith,<br>139 Allunga Road, Chigwell 7011,  |
| 834. | Mr. J. Veltkamp,<br>2/9 Hughes Court,<br>Prospect Vale 7250       | 853. | Ms. E. Hochenburger,<br>8 Victoria Street,<br>Kingston Beach 7050   |
| 835. | Mr. & Mrs. R. Gaitheran,<br>22 Upper McEwans Road,<br>Legana 7277 | 854. | Ms. E. Burke,<br>33 Andrew Street, Brighton 7030  |
| 836. | Mr. M. G. Ikin,<br>130 Hopkins Street, Moonah 7009                | 855. | Mr. L. M. Burke,<br>22 Andrew Street, Brighton 7030   |
| 837. | Mr. B. J. Byrne,<br>5 Wakehurst Road,<br>Austins Ferry 7011       | 856. | Mr. K. Harrington<br>118 Hill Street, West Hobart 7000  |
| 838. | Mr. N. Giunta,<br>12 Heskett Court, Rosny Point 7018              | 857. | Mrs. M. M. Summers,<br>PO Box 624, Burnie 7320,   |
| 839. | Mr. M. J. Quinn,<br>23 Somerdale Road, Claremont 7011             | 858. | Ms. M. Rees,<br>119 Bass Highway,<br>East Wynyard 7325  |
| 840. | Miss N. Fletcher,<br>50 Blowhole Road,<br>Blackmans Bay 7053      | 859. | Mr. & Mrs. D. & M. Parsissons,<br>Private Bag 216, New Norfolk 7140   |
| 841. | Mrs. M. Thomas,<br>16 Constance Ave, Glenorchy 7010               | 860. | Ms. J. Inglis,<br>281 Penguin Road, Ulverstone 7315,  |
| 842. | Mr. L. L. O'Brien,<br>22 Corranga Drive, Chigwell 7011            | 861. | Mr. M. Morgan,<br>19 Elphinstone Road, Mt. Stuart 7000  |
| 843. | Ms. G. C. Long,<br>36 George Street, Longford 7301                | 862. | Mr. D. Roper,<br>1 Gunyah Street, Howrah 7018,  |
| 844. | Mr. J. M. Cooney,<br>1/174 Abbott Street,<br>East Launceston 7250 | 863. | Ms. M. Middleton,<br>105 Main Road, Claremont 7011  |
| 845. | Ms. B. M. Clayton,<br>44 Irbys Boulevard,<br>Sisters Beach 7321   | 864. | Mr. L. Haley,<br>Box 15, Woodbridge 7162,   |
| 846. | Mr. R. McManus,<br>299 Acton Drive, Cambridge 7170                | 865. | Ms. H. D. O'Rourke,<br>PO Box 766, Burnie 7320  |
| 847. | Ms. T. Menzies,<br>Main Road, Forth, 7310                         | 866. | Ms. M. M. Spargo,<br>29 Fourth Ave., Dodges Ferry 7173  |
| 848. | Mrs. P. Osborne<br>19 Frederick Street,<br>West Hobart 7000       | 867. | Mr. M. E. Baptist,<br>14 Canning Street, Launceston 7250  |
| 849. | Mrs. T. M. Hutchinson,<br>9A Raymont Terrace, Mt. Stuart<br>7000  | 868. | Mr. Peter McKenzie,<br>446 Deviot Rd., Deviot 7275  |
| 850. | Ms. A. Fuller,<br>9 Berega Street, Howrah 7018                    | 869. | Mr. N. Guinane,<br>(student) St. Virgils College,<br>Austins Ferry 7011   |
| 851. | Mr. J. P. Graafland,<br>18 Riverside Drive, Launceston 7250       | 870. | Mrs. V. E. Brown,<br>53 Pomona Road,<br>West Riverside 7250   |
|      |   | 871. | K. Gibson,<br>The Parish Council, Catholic Parish<br>of Bellerive/Rokeby,<br>2 Alma Street, Bellerive 7018<br>(7 signatories) |
-

- 
- |      |  |      |   |
|------|--|------|---|
| 872. | Mr. A. E. Sharp,<br>109 Scenic Drive, Lewisham 7173.   | 889. | Mr. M. Nicholson,<br>106 Elizabeth Street,<br>Launceston 7250               |
| 873. | Ms. D. Bullock,<br>62 Main Street, St. Marys 7215,   | 890. | Rev. Charles Fehre<br>St. Paul's Rectory 476 Main Road<br>Glenorchy 7010    |
| 874. | Ms. H. Purdon,<br>13 Murray Street, Bicheno 7215   | 891. | Mrs. M. Hanlon,<br>3 Sunlea Place, Glenorchy 7010                           |
| 875. | No Name,<br>7/32 Victoria Parade,<br>Devonport, 7310   | 892. | Mrs. E. B. Watson,<br>Villa 2, 12 Milford Street,<br>Lindisfarne 7015       |
| 876. | Mrs. T. M. Lovell,<br>State President, Catholic Women's<br>League of NSW, 26 Hunter Street,<br>East Maitland 2323                | 893. | Mrs. V. V. Cramp,<br>146 Abbotsfield Road,<br>Claremont 7011                |
| 877. | Mr. C. Jones,<br>22 Arthur Street, Scottsdale 7260,  | 894. | Ms. D. Donoghue,<br>465 Oceana Drive, Howrah 7018                           |
| 878. | Ms. Pat Booth + 7 signatories (faxed)<br>Palliative Care Professionals   | 895. | Ms. P. Ackerly,<br>27 Sharland Ave, New Norfolk 7140                        |
| 879. | J. K. A. Clezy,<br>N. W. Medical Centre, Box 682,<br>Burnie 7320   | 896. | Mrs. M. Renahan,<br>27 George Street, Cygnet 7112                           |
| 880. | Mrs. B. Baker,<br>14 Georgina Court,<br>West Launceston 7250   | 897. | Mr. & Mrs. C. & J. Stuart,<br>3 Eastbourne Street,<br>South Launceston 7249 |
| 881. | Dr. H. Malcolm,<br>10 Victoria Street, Scottsdale 7260   | 898. | Mrs. N. Campbell,<br>23 Sinclair Ave,<br>West Launceston 7250               |
| 882. | Ms. K. Turner,<br>Royal Prince Alfred Hospital<br>Palliative Care Service,<br>Missenden Road,<br>Camperdown NSW 2050             | 899. | Ms. B. Smith,<br>28 Amherst Street, Ulverstone 7315                         |
| 883. | Dr. I. Martin, Suite 1,<br>170 George Street, Launceston 7250  | 900. | Mrs. A. White,<br>23 Nicholls Street, Devonport 7310                        |
| 884. | Mr. G. Williams,<br>Public Officer, Hospice Care<br>Association N.W. Tas. Inc.,<br>PO Box 1256, Burnie 7320                      | 901. | Ms. M. Males,<br>18 Ross Street, Beauty Point 7270                          |
| 885. | Mr. P. Keefe,<br>23 Yorkshire Court,<br>Prospect Vale 7250   | 902. | Ms. A. Roach,<br>510 Churchill Ave, Sandy Bay 7005                          |
| 886. | Mrs. S. Boyes,<br>NW Palliative Care Service,<br>11 Jones Street, Burnie 7320  | 903. | Mr. R. S. Lewis,<br>3 Moore Street, Wynyard 7325                            |
| 887. | Mr. & Mrs. A. & L. Benson<br>17 Mortyn Place, Howrah 7018  | 904. | Sister Patricia Bell,<br>1 Grange Avenue, Taroona 7053                      |
| 888. | Dr. R. Lowenthal,<br>Director of Medical Services,<br>Royal Hobart Hospital,<br>GPO Box 1061L, Hobart 7001<br>(including a book) | 905. | Sister Monica Franklin,<br>11 Rupert Ave, New Town 7008                     |
|      |  | 906. | Mrs. O. M. Filip,<br>87 New Town Road, New Town<br>7008                     |
|      |  | 907. | Mrs. J. Cowen,<br>273 Tolosa Street, Glenorchy 7010                         |
|      |  | 908. | Ms. S. M. Smith,  |
-



- 
- |      |   |      |  |
|------|---|------|--|
|      | 9/2 Albion Road, Bridgewater 7030   |      | Blackmans Bay 7052   |
| 909. | Mrs. T. Dobber OAM,<br>4/85 Tolosa Street, Glenorchy 7010                                   | 929. | Miss E. Hutchinson,<br>20B Swanston Street,<br>New Town 7008   |
| 910. | Ms. K. Twomey,<br>22/19 Hamilton Street,<br>West Hobart 7000                                | 930. | Mrs. M. E. James,<br>721 Sandy Bay Road,<br>Sandy Bay 7005   |
| 911. | Mr. T. P. McCarthy,<br>84 Esplanade, Rose Bay 7015  | 931. | Mr. & Mrs. P. & M. McCormack,<br>50 Rosevears Drive, Legana 7277   |
| 912. | Ms. M. L. Dobson,<br>3/76 East Derwent Highway,<br>Lindisfarne 7015                         | 932. | Ms. A. Belbin, "Windwhistle",<br>100 Nelsons Road, Lapoinya 7325   |
| 913. | Mrs. J. Downham,<br>Handham Lodge, Grass Tree<br>Hill Road, Richmond 7025                   | 933. | Mrs. J. Esterbrook,<br>25 Morris Ave, Devonport 7310   |
| 914. | Mrs. M. J. Midson,<br>6 Forbes Ave., West Hobart 7000                                       | 934. | Mr. P. Imlach, President, Human Life<br>Protection Society Inc.,<br>GPO Box 1158M, Hobart, 7001  |
| 915. | Mr. P. J. Jeffries, Unit 23,<br>27 Beach Road, Lindisfarne 7015                             | 935. | Mrs. D. McWilliam,<br>35 Riverview Road, Riverside 7250  |
| 916. | Ms. P. Simpson,<br>69 Millhouse Road, Longley 7150  | 936. | Ms. P. Hopkins,<br>635 Nubeena Road, Koonya 7187,  |
| 917. | Mrs. B. Jeffries, Unit 23,<br>27 Beach Road, Lindisfarne 7015                               | 937. | Ms. D. Hutchinson,<br>20B Swanston Street,<br>New Town 7008  |
| 918. | Mr. T. Sierzans,<br>6/10 Kensington Street,<br>Glenorchy 7010                               | 938. | Mr. J. Grace,<br>8 Mavis Court, Glenorchy 7010   |
| 919. | Mr. & Mrs. D. & J. Cumming,<br>38 Norwood Ave, Tarooma, 7053                                | 939. | Ms. C. Kratt,<br>40 Seddon Street, Austins Ferry 7011  |
| 920. | Mr. J. M. McCormack,<br>11 Banjorrah Street, Howrah 7018                                    | 940. | Mr. E. Mackey,<br>61 Giblin Street, Lenah Valley 7008  |
| 921. | Mr. M. Hamilton,<br>4 Mittara Cres., Chigwell 7011  | 941. | Mr. G. Williams, Public Officer,<br>Hospice Care Assoc.<br>PO Box 1256, Burnie 7320  |
| 922. | Mrs. B. J. Nichols,<br>21 Cornwall Street, Rose Bay 7015                                    | 942. | Mr. H. F. Nichols,<br>21 Cornwall Street, Rose Bay 7015  |
| 923. | Mrs. N. Suckling,<br>4 Miranda Place, Glenorchy 7010  | 943. | Mr. L. Pullen,<br>99 Norma Street, Howrah 7018   |
| 924. | Mr. J. Williams,<br>Lindisfarne-Risdonvale Catholic<br>Parish, 3 Bay Road, Lindisfarne 7015 | 944. | Mrs. C. Miller,<br>21 Percy Street, Devonport 7310   |
| 925. | Mr. F. W. Garth,<br>PO Box 34, Cygnet, 7112   | 945. | Mrs. J. Chambers,<br>26 Wyndella Street, West<br>Launceston 7250   |
| 926. | Mrs. J. Hamilton,<br>4 Mittara Crescent, Chigwell 7010                                      | 946. | Ms. M. O'Connor, Chair,<br>Euthanasia Working Party,<br>Victorian Assoc. for Hospice &<br>Palliative Care, Suite 3C, Level 2,<br>182 Victoria Parade,<br>East Melbourne 3002 |
| 927. | Mr. & Mrs. B. & M. Russell,<br>1 Roope Street, New Town 7008                                |      |  |
| 928. | Mr. D. Yeo,<br>14 Carinya Street,   |      |  |
-

- 
- |      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
| 947. | Ms. G. Buckley, North West Region,<br>Nursing Admin, Community &<br>Health Services, PO Box 258,<br>Burnie 7320 | Immaculate Heart of Mary,<br>55 Edge Avenue Lenah Valley 7008                                  |
| 948. | Mr. A. Grice,<br>44 Argyle Street, Hobart 7000  | 967. Mr. C. J. Castellino,<br>11 Edwardes Street, Burnie 7320                                  |
| 949. | The Ven. Dr. Phillip Aspinall,<br>Director, Anglicare Tasmania,<br>29 Elizabeth Mall, Hobart 7000               | 968. Mr. V. F. Thomas,<br>32A Clarendon Street,<br>Youngtown 7249                              |
| 950. | Mr. & Mrs. R. & M. Sykes,<br>8 Degraives Street,<br>South Hobart 7004   | 969. Mr. H. Watchorn,<br>38 Mawhera Avenue,<br>Sandy Bay 7005                                  |
| 951. | Mr. J. R. Martin,<br>2/1 Overell Street, Dynnyrne 7005  | 970. Ms. M. Franssen, "Little Flower"<br>17 Main Road, Exeter 7275                             |
| 952. | Miss M. Saunders,<br>8 Mellifont Street,<br>West Hobart 7000  | 971. Ms. M. Eagle,<br>Box 149, South Hobart 7004   |
| 953. | Mrs. D. Chapman,<br>2 Coolac Court, Lindisfarne 7015  | 972. Mr. E. McCarthy,<br>9 Ramsay Street, Newstead 7250,                                       |
| 954. | Mrs. M. Devries,<br>22 Cleburne Street, Kingston 7050   | 973. Ms. C. M. Radin,<br>10 Mayne Street, Invermay 7250  |
| 955. | Mr. R. Hopkins,<br>635 Nubeena Road, Koonya 7187  | 974. Mr. B. Searson,<br>177 Invermay Road,<br>Launceston 7250                                  |
| 956. | Mrs. B. Munnings,<br>107 Elizabeth Street, Kempton 7030   | 975. Mr. O. Lewis,<br>28/6 Federal Street, Burnie 7320   |
| 957. | Ms. J. Brettingham-Moore,<br>Richmond Road, Cambridge 7170  | 976. Mrs. P. A. Heazlewood,<br>5 Walkers Ave., Newnham 7248                                    |
| 958. | Mrs. B. P. Maguire,<br>52 Torquay Road,<br>East Devonport 7310  | 977. Revd. Fr. G. H. Jarrett,<br>Church of the Sacred Heart,<br>68 Clare Street, New Town 7008 |
| 959. | Sr. P. Chapman,<br>23 Stoke Street, New Town 7008   | 978. Mr. M. A. Chaplain,<br>28 Augusta Road, Lenah Valley 7008                                 |
| 960. | Ms. L. O'Neal,<br>77 Hill Street, Bellerive 7018  | 979. Ms. K. Pecnik,<br>60 Bay View Road, Lauderdale 7021,                                      |
| 961. | Mrs. L. Blackwell,<br>"Kellie", Elderslie 7030  | 980. Mr. G. M. Roberts (no address)  |
| 962. | Mr. P. Tierney,<br>47 Montagu Street, New Town 7008   | 981. Mr. A. F. Bevin,<br>12 Richmond Valley Road,<br>Richmond 7025                             |
| 963. | Dr. R. Walker,<br>44A Lincoln Street, Lindisfarne 7015  | 982. Mr. Daniel .....,<br>PO Box 108, Bridgewater 7030   |
| 964. | Mr. E. M. Linnard, Allanvale,<br>Hayley Court, Deviot 7275<br>(plus 10 signatories)                             | 983. Mrs. M. P. MacKinnon,<br>77 James Street, Devonport 7310                                  |
| 965. | Mrs. M. McGuinness,<br>6/21A Balmain Street,<br>Glenorchy 7010  | 984. Mrs. G. Leonard, "Trade Winds",<br>C/- Post Office, Karoola 7267                          |
| 966. | Fr. D. Allen,   | 985. Ms. R. Chambers,<br>26 Wyndella Street,<br>West Launceston 7250                           |
|      |   | 986. Ms. R. M. Peterson,   |
-

- 27 Malabar Street,  
East Launceston 7250
987. Mr. G. Cashion,  
357 St. Leonards Road,  
Launceston 7250
988. Mrs. A. Coltheart,  
Box 306, Queenstown 7467
989. Ms. O. M. Ryan,  
32A Clarendon Street,  
Young Town 7249
990. Ms. M. De Souza,  
6 Derwent Waters, 57 Cadbury  
Road, Claremont 7011
991. Ms. M. Puvrand,  
140 Trevor Street, Ulverstone 7315
992. Mr. John Adkins,  
30 Watson's Road, Kettering 7155
993. Mrs. G. M. Hendrey,  
83 Bel-Air Cres.,  
East Devonport 7310
994. Ms. D. Craig,  
12 Fulford Street, Trevallyn 7250
995. Ms. V. Dillon,  
Sampsons Ave., Smithton 7330
996. Mr. R. W. Kay,  
9 Manly Avenue, Lindisfarne 7015
997. Sister Ana Hopoate,  
Carmelite Monastery,  
Cambridge Street, Launceston 7250
998. Ms. K. Shaw,  
7304 Channel Highway,  
Cygnet 7112
999. Mr. W. G. Walsh,  
30 Campbell Street,  
Launceston 7250
1000. Mrs. E. McBain,  
2 Alma Street,  
Bellerive 7018
1001. Mrs. G. Jones,  
47 Mason Street,  
Claremont 7011
1002. Br. Geoffrey Whitefield,  
PO Box 77,  
Bridgewater
1003. Ms. M. E. Fisher,  
51 Clare Street,  
New Town 7008
1004. Ms. J. M. Dance,
- 67 Clare Street,  
New Town 7008
1005. Sr. M. J. McVilly,  
1 Shawfield Street,  
Lenah Valley 7008
1006. Mr. R. Roberts,  
9 Sumburg Street,  
Devonport 7310
1007. Mr. & Mrs. P. & M. Pyke,  
388 Rheban Road,  
Orford 7190
1008. Ms. A. Piaszczyk,  
7 Croome Court,  
Berriedale 7011
1009. Mr. & Mrs. S. & A. Greener,  
39 Cliff View Drive,  
Allens Rivulet 7150
1010. Ms. M. C. Direen,  
15 Kensington Street,  
Glenorchy 7010
1011. Ms. P. J. Dance,  
Emmanuel Pastoral &  
Spirituality Centre,  
123 Abbott Street,  
Newstead 7250,
1012. Mr. A. de Haan,  
5 Valley View Drive,  
Riverside 7250
1013. Dr. D. M. Blackburn,  
"Highlands", Palmers Road  
Latrobe 7307
1014. Mr. & Mrs. J. & R. Tarvydas,  
26 Balmain Street,  
Glenorchy 7010
1015. Mr. W. Richards,  
36 Malunna Road,  
Lindisfarne 7015
1016. Mr. & Mrs. T. & L. Murphy,  
109 Percy Street,  
Devonport 7310
1017. Ms. A. Taylor,  
29 Funslow Road,  
Collinsvale 7012
1018. Mrs. A. M. Dale,  
27 Berean Street,  
East Launceston 7249
1019. Mrs. M. Fitzpatrick,  
5/5 Cypress Street,  
Launceston 7250
1020. Mr. M. W. Wrankmere,

- 163 Opossum Road,  
Norwood 7250
1021. Mr. F. Lottenbach,  
C/- A. Berin,  
"Southernwood",  
Richmond Valley Road,  
Richmond 7025
1022. Mrs. M. Foale,  
25 Marana Avenue,  
Lindisfarne 7015
1023. Mrs. M. Castellino,  
35 Coolabah Road,  
Sandy Bay 7005
1024. Ms. M. Abersek,  
49 Grosvenor Street,  
Sandy Bay 7005
1025. Dr. C. & Mr. E. Maloney,  
8/98 Arthur Street,  
West Hobart 7000
1026. Mr. W. D. Lawler,  
32 Karoola Road,  
Lindisfarne 7015
1027. Miss R. Farrington,  
Lord Fraser Home,  
8/8 Lewis Street,  
North Hobart 7000
1028. Mr. K. T. Lee-Archer,  
4 College Street,  
Launceston 7250
1029. Mrs. A. Tiemens,  
79 Rannoch Avenue,  
Launceston 7250
1030. Mr. P. B. Ferrall,  
8 Direen Street,  
Mowbray 7250
1031. Mrs. Veronica Ygosse,  
28 O'Brien Street,  
Glenorchy 7010
1032. Fr. Christopher Mithen,  
St. Joseph's Retreat,  
65 Harrington Street,  
Hobart 7000
1033. Mrs. M. Butterworth,  
68A Forest Road,  
Trevallyn 7250
1034. Mr. & Mrs. E. & L. VanderVelde,  
66 Mulgrave Street,  
South Launceston 7249
1035. Mrs. R. Giudici,  
109 Lansdowne Crescent,  
West Hobart 7000
1036. Mr. & Mrs. P. & C. Van der  
Heide,  
40 Benwerrin Court,  
Norwood 7250
1037. Mr. R. Lawler,  
32 Karoola Road,  
Lindisfarne 7015
1038. Ms. G. T. Coleman,  
34 Belar Street,  
Howrah 7112
1039. Mr. L. F. Field,  
34 Belar Street,  
Howrah 7112,
1040. Mr. D. Eugster,  
3 Giblin Street,  
Lenah Valley 7008
1041. Mrs. I. Corbett,  
1 Jones Parade,  
Lewisham 7173
1042. Dr. M. L. Parkinson,  
68 Risdon Road,  
New Town 7008
1043. Ms. B. Hughes,  
18 Dynnyrne Road,  
Dynnyrne 7005
1044. Mr. B. J. P. McCarthy,  
82 Esplanade,  
Rose Bay 7015
1045. Ms. T. Lee-Archer,  
4 College Street,  
Launceston 7250
1046. Dr. R. Macintyre Smith,  
4 Myrtle Court,  
Mount Nelson 7007
1047. Mrs. M. Busch,  
19 Dickson Street,  
West Moonah 7009
1048. Mrs. J. P. Horn,  
57 Ann Street,  
Launceston 7250
1049. Ms. P. McLeod,  
11 Corina Place,  
Kingston 7050
1050. Mrs. S. Storey,  
130 Saltwater River Road,  
Premaydena 7185
1051. Ms. M. Montes,  
37 Windsor Street,  
Kingston Beach 7050

- 
- |       |   |   |
|-------|---|---|
| 1052. | Mr. A. L. Andrews,<br>PO Box 2005,<br>Hobart 7001   | 8 Mavis Court,<br>Glenorchy 7010  |
| 1053. | Ms. K. Boulton,<br>102 Howrah Road,<br>Howrah 7018  | 1068. Ms. S. Tisch,<br>27 Red Chapel Avenue,<br>Sandy Bay 7005              |
| 1054. | Ms. S. Wyly,<br>5 Anderson Road,<br>Trevallyn 7250  | 1069. Mr. P. A. Dowson,<br>15 Dresden Street,<br>Sandy Bay 7005             |
| 1055. | Ms. K. Alvir,<br>27 Red Chapel Ave,<br>Sandy Bay 7005   | 1070. Mr. K. Aikins,<br>5 Crescent Drive,<br>Margate 7054                   |
| 1056. | Mr. & Mrs. C. & K. Westwood,<br>40 Sherwood Court,<br>Lindisfarne 7015  | 1071. Mrs. J. Foulkes,<br>131 Hill Street,<br>West Hobart 7000              |
| 1057. | Mrs. M. P. Hutchinson,<br>22 Clarence Street,<br>Launceston 7250  | 1072. Mr. P. Briggs,<br>19 England Avenue,<br>Montrose 7010                 |
| 1058. | Ms. B. Huigsloot,<br>35 Grove Road,<br>Glenorchy 7010   | 1073. Mr. C. M. Burdick,<br>5 Kent Street,<br>Franklin 7113                 |
| 1059. | Mrs. C. Jansz,<br>94 Gordons Hill Road,<br>Lindisfarne 7015   | 1074. Mrs. J. M. Aiken,<br>53 Malunna Road,<br>Lindisfarne 7015             |
| 1060. | Mr. & Mrs. E. & M. Natoli,<br>"Salina", Tasman Highway<br>Sorell 7172   | 1075. Mr. S. Smyth,<br>34 Kelly Street,<br>Battery Point 7000               |
| 1061. | Mr. K. S. Foale,<br>25 Marana Avenue,<br>Lindisfarne 7015   | 1076. Miss. R. Burdick,<br>5 Kent Street,<br>Franklin 7113                  |
| 1062. | Mr. M. A. Harradine,<br>54 Montrose Road,<br>Montrose 7010  | 1077. Ms. A. McKeown,<br>27 Red Chapel Avenue,<br>Sandy Bay 7005            |
| 1063. | Mr. S. Roberts,<br>President,<br>St. Mary's Conference,<br>St. Vincent de Paul Society,<br>17 Oakley Street,<br>New Town 7008 | 1078. Mr. P. G. North,<br>45 Cleghorn Avenue,<br>Riverside 7250             |
| 1064. | Monsignor Philip Green,<br>Catholic Parish of Sandy Bay<br>and Tarooma,<br>PO Box 37,<br>Sandy Bay 7006                       | 1079. Mr. W. F. Pless,<br>PO Box 215,<br>Claremont, 7011                    |
| 1065. | Ms. C. Bennett,<br>650 Bennetts Road,<br>Elizabeth Town 7304  | 1080. Mr. E. R. Lockley,<br>2 Zeehan Street,<br>Warrane 7018                |
| 1066. | Mrs. M. J. Tierney,<br>16 Kaoota Road,<br>Rose Bay 7015   | 1081. Archdeacon Peter and Mrs. N.<br>Stuart,<br>PO Box 655,<br>Moonah 7009 |
| 1067. | Ms. B. J. Grace,  | 1082. Ms. H. Quinn,<br>55 Devines Road,<br>West Moonah 7009                 |
|       |   | 1083. Dr. M. Cook,<br>31 Alexander Street,                                  |
-

- Sandy Bay 7005  
12 Clarke Street,  
Ararat 3377
1084. Dr. M. Wallington,  
Senior Consultant in Radiation  
Oncology,  
Department of Radiation Oncology,  
Royal Hobart Hospital,  
GPO Box 1061L,  
Hobart 7000
1085. Dr. C. Middleton,  
170 George Street,  
Launceston 7250
1086. Ms. Clare Healy,  
1 Adams Street,  
Sandy Bay 7005
1087. Adrian L. Doyle,  
Vicar-General,  
Archdiocese of Hobart,  
GPO Box 62A,  
Hobart, 7001
1088. Dr. O. Spruyt,  
Staff Specialist in Palliative  
Medicine,  
Eversleigh Hospital,  
PO Box 124,  
Petersham NSW 2049
1089. Rev. Dr. Bill Jackson,  
Public Questions Officer,  
Baptist Churches of Tasmania,  
22 Wellington Street,  
Launceston 7250
1090. Mr. R. Johnson,  
Manager,  
Hobart Community Legal Service  
Inc.,  
166 Macquarie Street,  
Hobart 7000
1091. Dr. C. Smith,  
John Street Medical Centre,  
5 John Street  
Kingston 7050
1092. Ms. P. Edman,  
cathmediatas@postoffice.trump  
.net.au
1093. Mr. P. D. Wilde,  
wilde@postoffice.sandybay.utas  
.edu.au
1094. Ms. P.A. Edman for the  
Archdiocese of Hobart Social  
Justice Commission,  
GPO Box 62A,  
Hobart 7001
1095. Rev. Greg Fraser,  
Church and Nation Committee,  
Presbyterian Church of Victoria,
1096. Ms. M. Campbell,  
National President,  
Catholic Women's League,  
Australia (Inc),  
PO Box 239,  
Sandy Bay 7005
1097. Dr. D. van Gend, TRUST,  
14 Parooba Ave,  
Camp Hill Qld. 4152
1098. Rev. N. Ford,  
Director,  
Caroline Chisholm Centre for  
Health Ethics,  
7th Floor,  
166 Gipps Street,  
East Melbourne 3002
1099. Ms. E. Smyth,  
34 Kelly Street,  
Battery Point 7000
1100. Palliative Care Nurses,  
(20 signatories)
1101. Dr. C. Newell,  
Senior Lecturer,  
Division of Community  
and Rural Health,  
University of Tasmania,  
17 Liverpool Street,  
Hobart. 7000
1102. Dr. M. Otlowski,  
Senior Lecturer in Law,  
Law School,  
University of Tasmania,  
GPO Box 252-89,  
Hobart 7001
1103. Ms. Julie Monkhouse,  
Legana, 7277,  
(Submission with 14  
signatories)
1104. Mr. P. M. Roach,  
510 Churchill Avenue,  
Sandy Bay 7005,
1105. Dr. P. Dunne,  
Vice President of the  
Tasmanian Association of  
Hospice & Palliative Care,  
29 Bowden Street,  
Glenorchy 7010
1106. Dr. D. J. Boadle,  
168 St. John Street, Launceston 7250
1107. **Confidential** Mr. Grant Millington,  
PO Box 265, Kettering, Tas 7155

1108. Mr. T. A. Harper,  
Tasmanian Aids Council,  
GPO Box 595F, Hobart 7001
1109. Ms. J. Moscott,  
2a Culloiden Avenue,  
East Moonah 7009
1110. Dr. L. M. Montes,  
37 Windsor Street,  
Kingston Beach 7050
1111. Dr. A. C. Grice,  
44 Argyle Street, Hobart 7000
1112. Mr. P. Hutchinson,  
22 Clarence Street, Launceston 7250
1113. Mr. K. A. Ryan,  
193 Tolosa Street, Glenorchy 7010
1114. Mrs. A. Morton, Chairperson,  
Parish Pastoral Council  
Lindisfarne-Risdonvale Catholic  
Parish, 3 Bay Road,  
Lindisfarne 7015
1115. Mr. D. Mills,  
74 Carlton Street, New Town, 7008
1116. Archbishop Eric D'Arcy,  
Mount St. Canice,  
GPO Box 62A, Hobart 7001
1117. Prof. R. Lowenthal, President.  
& 146 Tasmanian Branch of the Australian  
Medical Association, 2 Gore Street,  
South Hobart 7004
1118. Dr. P. Thomson,  
Cascade Road Medical Centre,  
30A Cascade Road,  
South Hobart 7004
- LATE SUBMISSIONS**  
**(Submissions received after 30 June, 1997)**
1119. Sr. B. Madden,  
Good Shepherd Convent,  
2 Wakehurst Street,  
Austins Ferry 7011
1120. Mr. J. W. Wall,  
PO Box 48,  
Latrobe, 7307
1121. Ms. J. Vanderwal,  
55 Lady Penrhyn Drive,  
Huntingfield 7055
1122. Ms. M. Patermo,  
12 Myna Park Road,  
Old Beach 7017
1123. Ms. E. Wierenga,
- No address
1124. Mr. D. B. Shirley,  
4 Layete Street,  
Dodges Ferry 7173
1125. Mrs. R. Langshaw,  
11 Mayne Street,  
Invermay 7248
1126. Ms. S. Lees,  
15 Batman Highway,  
Sidmouth 7270
1127. Mr. & Mrs. L. & G. Vout,  
14 Connewarre Crescent  
Berriedale 7011
1128. Mr. F. Peacock,  
32 Flinders Esplanade,  
Taroona 7053
1129. Ms. Lisbeth A. Eastoe,  
60 Frankland Street,  
Launceston
1130. Mr. A.W.M. Hunn,  
"Montagu House",  
49 Augusta Road,  
Lenah Valley 7008
1131. Mrs. M. Kay,  
9 Manly Avenue,  
Lindisfarne 7015
1132. Dr. & Mrs. P. & E. Hunt,  
5 Kent Street,  
Franklin 7113
1133. Mr. O. Goninon,  
83 Upper Fitzroy Crescent,  
South Hobart 7004,
1134. Mrs. A. R. Smith,  
37 Winston Avenue,  
Seven Mile Beach
1135. Mr. & Mrs. G. & N. Keith,  
66 Beach Road,  
Kingston Beach 7050
1136. Mr. A. S. Molyneaux,  
16 Worsley Drive,  
Margate 7054
1137. Mr. & Mrs. T. & M. O'Malley,  
290 Main Road,  
Austins Ferry 7011
1138. Mr. Francis J. Gillespie,  
(no address)
1139. Ms. E. Bushby,  
6 Amanda Court,  
West Launceston 7250

- 
1140. Ms. R. Saward,  
165 Punchbowl Road,  
Launceston 7250
1141. Dr. C. Smith,  
John Street Medical Centre,  
5 John Street,  
Kingston 7050
1142. Mr. J. Zubrzycki,  
Emeritus Professor,  
68 Schlich Street,  
Yarralumla ACT 2600
1143. Ms. B. Whitehouse,  
5 Nutgrove Ave,  
Sandy Bay 7005
1144. Ms. L. H. Groves,  
Missionary Sisters of Service,  
Box 92  
Ellendale 7140
1145. Mr. P. J. Sullivan,  
Board of Directors,  
St. Vincent's Hospital,  
PO Box 2021, Launceston 7250
1146. Ms. C. Taylor,  
PO Box 34,  
Hagley 7242
1147. Mrs. L. Yeo,  
14 Carinya Street,  
Blackmans Bay 7052
1148. Ms. J. Stratton,  
220A Best Street,  
Devonport 7310
1149. Mr. H. G. Giler,  
9 Esplanade,  
Turners Beach 7315
1150. Mrs. G.E. Buckley,  
35 Payne Street,  
Burnie 7320
1151. Mrs. F. Dwight,  
7 Cann Street,  
Penguin 7316
1152. Ms. B. Francis,  
National & Overseas Coordinator,  
Endeavour Forum,  
12 Denham Place,  
Toorak 3142
1153. Rev. R. J. Fraser,  
General Secretary,  
Tasmanian Council of Churches,  
29 Bathurst Street,  
Hobart 7000
1154. Ms. S. Pitt,  
7 Bedford Street,
- New Town 7008
1155. Mr. D. Hiscutt,  
President,  
Parish Council,  
St. Mary's Catholic Church,  
PO Box 19,  
Penguin 7316
1156. Ms. S. Steele,  
44 Wentworth Street,  
South Hobart 7000
1157. Dr. John Keown,  
Queens' College,  
Cambridge CB3 9ET,
1158. Mrs. Colleen Stewart,  
30 Railway Terrace,  
Mile End,  
South Australia 5031
1159. Dr. George Merridew,  
Launceston General Hospital  
Department of Anaesthesia,  
Charles Street  
Launceston 7250
1160. Dr. James O'Neill,  
26 Morang Avenue,  
Lower Templestowe, Vic. 3107
1161. Dr. Robert Pollnitz,  
Chairman,  
Lutheran Church of Australia,  
16 Bagot Street,  
North Adelaide 5006
1162. Mr. Rob Beattie,  
174 Macquarie Street,  
Hobart, 7000
-



**APPENDIX 2****DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AND TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE**

1. Mr. K. Andrews, MP, Room RG 116, Parliament House, Canberra 2600, submission dated 3 July 1997.
  2. Prof. Peter Ravenscroft, Professor of Palliative Care University of Newcastle, Director of Palliative Care, Newcastle Mater Hospital, Area Director of Palliative Care, Hunter Area Health Service and President, Australian & New Zealand Society for Palliative Medicine - "Inquiry into the Need for Legislation on Voluntary Euthanasia in Tasmania". dated 18 June, 1997.
  3. Mrs. Lynette Ross - Submission on Euthanasia dated 17 June, 1997.
  4. Mrs. Brenda Kent - Enquiry into the Need for Legislation on Voluntary Euthanasia in Tasmania, dated 19 June, 1997 19/6/97
  5. Dr. A. A. Yacoub - '*Prayer and Medical Treatment*' - Businessgram, April 1989
  6. Mrs. Hurcum - Draft Protocol and Draft Advanced Directive.
  7. Dr. P. J. Martyr, Lecturer, Tasmanian School of Nursing University of Tasmania, Launceston - Brief Statement on Euthanasia.
  8. Mr. Rodney J. Saunders - Submission - Euthanasia Legislation dated 19 June, 1997.
  9. Mr. J. A. Dumaresq, 477 Pateena Road, Longford - Submission to Parliamentary Committee on Voluntary Euthanasia.
  10. Mr. Ken Clayton - Euthanasia.
  11. Mr. Lindsay Benson, 65 Mooreville Road, Burnie 7320 Submission dated 24 June, 1997.
  12. Mrs. Anne Vincent, 27 Irby Boulevard, Sisters Beach 7321 submission against the Legislation of Voluntary Euthanasia.
  13. Mrs. Pat Hayes, Catholic Women's League (Tasmania) Inc.- Submission to Inquiry into Need for Legislation on Voluntary Euthanasia.
  14. Mrs. Kathleen Pierce - Legislation on Voluntary Euthanasia
  15. Mrs. Marlene Hampton - Submission dated 26 June, 1997
  16. Reverend Bill Magor, Devonport Baptist Church - Voluntary
-

- Euthanasia Inquiry - dated 26 June, 1997.
17. Mrs. Norma Jamison, President of the Voluntary Euthanasia Society -
    1. Voluntary Euthanasia Society of Tasmania Submission dated 23 June, 1997.
    2. "*Sometimes a Small Victory*" - by Sheila A. M. McLean and Alison Britton, published 1996 by the Institute of Law and Ethics in Medicine, University of Glasgow.
  18. Mrs. Carola Morgan, Australian Family Association - 'A Supplementary Submission from the Australian Family Association Tasmania Branch'
  19. Mrs. Sue Boyes, North West Palliative Care Service, 11 Jones Street, Burnie 7320, 'Submission to the House of Assembly Community Development Committee'
  20. Hon. Dr. Frank Madill MHA -
    1. 'Euthanasia' dated 22nd July, 1997
    2. '*Dying with Dignity*' Guidelines on the Care and Management of People who are Dying - Community and Health Services, January 1996.
  21. Dr. Brian Pollard 'Some Aspects of Euthanasia in the Netherlands'
  22. Professor J. Norelle Lickiss, Palliative Care Department, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney -
    1. '*Doctors, The Dying Patient and the Law*' by Norelle Lickiss
    2. '*Regarding Euthanasia*' by David Roy and Charles-Henri Rapin.
    3. '*Supreme Court of United States' Ruling on assisted suicide.*'
  23. Mrs. Betty Roberts OAM - 'Oral Submission to the House of Assembly Community Development Committee dated 22 July, 1997.'
  - 24.. Mrs. Lilia Weatherley - 'Euthanasia Committee, July 1997 Submission'
  25. Dr. Gawler, Right to Life Australia - Book - '*The Troubled Dream of Life - Living with Mortality*' by Daniel Callahan, Simon & Schuster 1993
  26. Reverend David Johnson - Ross A. Vincent - Euthanasia dated 7 April, 1997
  27. Ms. Colleen Cartwright, University of Queensland, Department of Social and Preventive Medicine
-

1. "Healthy Ageing, Healthy Dying: Community and Health Professional Perspectives on End-Of-Life Decision-Making."  
Report to the Research and Development Grants Advisory Committee of the Department of Human Services and Health - February 1996.
  2. "End-of-Life Decision-Making : Perspectives of General Practitioners and Patients."  
Report to the Research and Development Grants Advisory Committee of the Department of Human Services and Health - February 1996.
  27. Christopher Newell and Ian Parsons, *Managing Mortality: Euthanasia on Trial*, Villamanta Publishing Service, Geelong West, 1996
  28. Margaret Otlowski, *Voluntary Euthanasia and The Common Law*, Oxford University Press 1997.
  30. William Molloy, *Let Me Decide*, Penguin Books Australia Ltd., Ringwood, 1996
  31. New South Wales Parliamentary Library Research Service:
    - (a.) *Euthanasia*, G. Griffith and M. Swain, Background Paper No.3, 1995
    - (b.) *Euthanasia: Summary and Update*, G. Griffith, Briefing Paper No. 4, 1996
  32. Parliamentary Research Service, Commonwealth Parliament of Australia:
    1. 'Choice, Quality of Life and Self-Control: Summary Arguments in Support of Euthanasia', Research Note No. 12, 1996
    2. 'The Sanctity of Life: Summary Arguments Opposing Euthanasia', Research Note No. 13, 1996
  33. Margaret Brown, Lecturer, School of Social Work and Social Policy, University of South Australia.
    1. 'Who Would You Choose? Appointing an Agent with a Medical Power of Attorney', Australian Journal on Ageing, Vol. 16, No. 4, 1997
    2. Margaret Brown, Melanie Wakefield, Justin Beilby & Eric Gargett, *Advance Directive (Schedule 2) Community Study, Final Report*, University of South Australia, 1997
  34. Professor Michael Ashby, Professor of Palliative Care, Department of Medicine, Monash University:
    1. 'Of Life and Death: The Canadian and Australian Senates on Palliative Care and Euthanasia', Journal of Law and Medicine, Vol.5, 1997;
    2. 'Hard Cases, Causation and Care of the Dying', Journal of Law and Medicine, Vol. 3, 1995
    3. Michael Ashby, Melanie Wakefield & Justin Beilby, 'General practitioners' knowledge and use of living wills', British Medical Journal, Vol. 310, 1995
  35. Peter Singer, Associate Director, Centre for Bioethics, University of Toronto:
    1. 'Bioethics for clinicians: Advance care planning', Canadian Medical Association Journal, 155 (12), 1996;
-

2. *Living Will*, Centre for Bioethics, University of Toronto, 1994
36. Helga Kuhse, Peter Singer, Peter Baume, Malcolm Clark & Maurice Rickard, 'End-of-life decisions in Australian medical practice', *Medical Journal of Australia*, Vol. 166, 1997
37. John Blackwood, President of the Guardianship and Administration Board:
  1. 'I would rather die with two feet than live with one: The Status and Legality of Advance Directives in Australia', University of Queensland Law Journal, Vol.19, 1997
  2. Decisions about Medical Treatment: How can Advance Directives and Enduring Guardians Help?, (unpublished paper)
38. Brenda McGivern, paper titled, Advance Directives and Legislative Reform.

## Reports

House of Lords, *Report of the Select Committee on Medical Ethics*, 1994

Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory, *Select Committee on Euthanasia Report, Voluntary and Natural Death Bill 1993*, 1994

Legislative Assembly of the Northern Territory, *Report of the Inquiry by the Select Committee on Euthanasia, The Right of the Individual or the Common Good*, 1995

New York State Task Force on Life and the Law, *When Death is Sought, Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia in the Medical Context*, 1994

Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, Senate Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee, *Euthanasia Laws Bill 1996*, 1997

Parliament of South Australia, *Report of the Select Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Death and Dying*, 1992

Senate of Canada, *Of Life and Death, Report of the Special Senate Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide*, 1995

---

## APPENDIX 3

### WITNESSES

Rev. Quak, Reform Church of Launceston  
Mrs. Elizabeth Springer  
Professor Peter Ravenscroft, Professor of Palliative Care, University of Newcastle, Director Palliative Care, Newcastle Mater Hospital  
Rev. Keith Kleyn, Free Public Reform Church of Legana  
Mrs Lynette Ross  
Mr Andrew Piper  
Mr. Terry Hauge  
Ms Brenda Kent, Family Based Care Association  
Mr. Jan Siejka, Ethnic Communities Council of Tasmania  
Dr. A. A. Yacoub, Consultant Anaesthetist  
Mr. William Stephens  
Ms Elaine Walker  
Ms Jill Willey  
Ms Patricia Hayward  
Mrs Kay Hurcum  
Mrs. Dawn Bradford  
Mrs. Edith De Vermond  
Mrs Winifred Will  
Dr. Phillipa Martyr, Lecturer, Tasmanian School of Nursing, University of Tasmania  
Mr. Rodney Saunders  
Ms Joyce Bissland  
Ms. Bernice Heys  
Dr. Klass De Jonge, General Practitioner  
Mr. J Alan Dumaresq  
Dr. Peter Johnson  
Mr. Kevin Lowry, Chairman, Southern Cross Homes, Tasmania  
Dr. Fleming, Director, Southern Cross Bioethics Institute  
Mr. Ian Moncrieff  
Mr. Ken Clayton  
Mr. Lindsay Benson  
Ms Noreen Jacklyn  
Ms Ann Vincent  
Ms Pat Hayes, Catholic Women's Association  
Ms Kathleen Pierce, Catholic Women's Association  
Mrs. Margaret Wilson  
Mrs. Marlene Hampton  
Mr. Broer Westerbeek  
Mr. Bill Magor  
Ms Pam Pattison, Director of Nursing - Karingal Home for the Aged  
Ms Rosalie Medcraft  
Ms Norma Jamison, VEST  
Ms Debrin Halpin  
Ms Francis Halpin  
Ms Georgina Halpin  
Mrs. P. Cotterill  
Ms Marjorie Tewson  
Ms Mary Binks  
Ms C. Morgan, Australian Family Association  
Ms C. Page  
Ms Marie Nibbs, Australian Family Association

---

Dr. Robert Parks, Director, Intensive Care, Launceston General Hospital  
 Dr. Bryn Parry, General Practitioner  
 Mrs. Agnes Harris  
 Mrs. Judy Herpich  
 Mr. John Maguire  
 Ms Sue Boyes, Palliative Care Nurse  
 Mrs. Margaret Williams  
 Dr. Frank Madill, MHA  
 Dr. Graham Bury, Director Neonatal Services, Royal Hobart Hospital  
 Mrs. Mary Ikin  
 Mrs. Clare Healy  
 Archbishop Eric D'Arcy  
 Dr. Brendan Nelson, MHR  
 Dr. Jennifer Phillip, Palliative Care Services, Alfred Hospital, Melbourne  
 Dr. Brian Pollard  
 Ms. Shirley Donaghue  
 Mrs. Betty Roberts  
 Mrs. Fran Gillespie  
 Mrs. Iris Smythe, Catholic Women's League Inc.  
 Ms. Pat Challis  
 Dr. Michael Loughhead, Hobart Heart Centre  
 Mrs. Laurel Benson  
 Mrs. Patricia Hopkins  
 Dr. Margaret Otlowski, Senior Lecturer in Law, University of Tasmania  
 Senator Dr. Bob Brown  
 Mr. Pat Flanagan  
 Mrs. Ann Smith  
 Archdeacon Dr. Phillip Aspinall, Director of Anglicare, Tasmania, Anglican Church of Australia  
 Ms. Lilia Weatherly  
 Mr. Ted Cutland  
 Ms. Joy Stone  
 Dr. David Gawler, Right to Life, Australia  
 Dr. Brian Walpole, Former Director of Emergency Medicine Department, Royal Hobart Hospital  
 Dr. Christopher Newell, Lecturer in Community and Rural Health, University of Tasmania  
 Father Terry Southerwood, Eastern Shore Ministers' Association  
 Ms. Ann Bratt  
 Rev. Hans Kelder, Reform Church, Kingston  
 Rev. David Johnson  
 Senator Eric Abetz  
 Professor Ray Lowenthal, President, Tasmanian Branch, Australian Medical Association, Director  
 of Medical Oncology, Royal Hobart Hospital, Clinical Professor, Faculty of Medicine,  
 University of Tasmania.  
 Major-General Dr. William Brian (Digger) James, National President, Returned Services League  
 Dr. Reginald McDonald  
 Dr. Paul Dunne, Vice President of Tasmanian Hospice and Palliative Care.  
 Mr. Robert Johnson, Hobart Community Legal Service  
 Dr. Gerard Flaherty, General Practitioner  
 Mr. Todd Harper, Tasmanian Aids Council  
 Dr. Phillip Thompson, General Practitioner  
 Mr. Peter Roach  
 Ms. Robyn Wolstenhome, Research Officer, Anglicare Tasmania  
 Mr. John Le Breton, Director, Office of the Public Guardian of New South Wales  
 Ms. Deborah Frith, Community Education Officer, Office of the Public Guardian of New South Wales  
 Ms. Amanda Adrian, Acting Director for the Centre for Clinical Policy and Practice, New South Wales  
 Health.  
 Dr. Janine Liddle, Medical Officer, Centre for Clinical Policy and Practice, New South Wales  
 Health.  
 Professor Norelle Lickiss, Director of Palliative Care, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney, New  
 South Wales

Ms. Margaret Brown, Lecturer, School of Social Work and Social Policy, University of South  
Australia  
Ms. Vicki Lindner, Public Affairs, South Australian Health Commission  
Ms. Lisa Huber, Education Officer, South Australian Health Commission  
Ms. Sally Williams, Palliative Care  
Ms. Mary Blackwood, Department of Community and Health Services  
Mr. Damien Smith, Department of Community and Health Services  
Mr. John Blackwood, President of the Guardianship and Administration Board  
Ms. Lisa Warner, Public Guardian, Public Trustee