

TO: Standing Committee, Parliament of Victoria

FROM: Dr. Kameel Majdali, [REDACTED]. Tel. [REDACTED], email: [REDACTED]

RE: End of Life Choices

I would like to state from the outset that quality of life is of immense importance. However, there are probably different ideas of what this is and how to apply it.

In short, when people are suffering and at the end of their lives, reasonable measures of comfort and palliative care should be applied. The sufferer's wishes about whether to 'turn off the machine' should be honoured. Chances are that most people would agree with these measures.

However, when it comes to issues of 'assisted suicide' or 'euthanasia,' these are measures that:

- 1) Have been rejected in the past and
- 2) Should be rejected in the future. In an age where people are going 'organic' and 'natural' — for good reason — these latter two measure are anything but.

Proponents of these measures will package them as 'compassionate,' 'merciful,' and 'progressive,' allowing the terminally ill to 'die with dignity.' We need to go beyond slogans and feel-good measures to assess the very serious and dangerous nature of these moves.

In the few countries that have such measures, it is a fact that:

- A. Voluntary euthanasia turns to involuntary, with no way to protect the vulnerable;
- B. Assurances of safeguards are often ineffective;
- C. With spiralling medical costs, the temptation to resort to involuntary euthanasia in order to 'free up a bed' will become greater;
- D. Such measures, which is akin to putting down a pet, is anything but a quality of life issue - is shows that life is cheap and easily disposed.

Civilisation has rightly rejected the power to end people's life - and this needs to continue, for the protection of all.

[REDACTED]

KAMEEL MAJDALI