From: D&B Evans

Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2016 4:18 PM

**To:** Physician-Assisted Dying Committee Comité Aide médicale à mourir

**Subject:** Physician assisted suicide

Members of the Joint (Parliamentary) Committee on Physician Assisted Suicide:

Dear Committee members: This brief will be brief, because, having over several years written letters and filled out questionnaires to register my deep support for what I call MARS (medically assisted rational suicide), borrowing the acronym from a British DWD society, I realize that we have long since reached the 'meta' stage in discussing this issue. That is, everything that can be said on the matter has been said thousands of times, and everything that can be empirically tested has been tested--in several European countries and in Oregon and Washington states, for example. In other words, the ploy of acting as though physician assisted suicide is a newly broached, perplexingly problematic consideration is just that--a ploy by 'the usual suspect' religionists to stall until their anti-secularist views can win the day by attrition. To paraphrase lawyer Joseph Avray in arguing before the Supreme Court its decision to put enactment of new DWD laws on hold for 6 (or 4)months: What could conceivably require further study when there are 15,000 pages of testimony on the record--just for Canada, never mind the rest of the world's treatment of the balance sought between allaying unnecessary suffering and protecting any individual from mistreatment.? To which I would add the rhetorical question: 'Where, in 2016 Canada, will you find anyone--on or off a Parliamentary Committee--who is not familiar with the problematics and doesn't have an at least semi-considered view of them? ' (If there are such people they may, of course, vote, but their input is not to be taken seriously.)

I have communicated enough with the leadership of DWD Canada to be confident that whatever they say in their appearance before you this week will perfectly well represent my views on specific aspects of what needs doing to convert the abstract right the Court has recognized into workable, humane laws. 'Perfectly well' except for an observation I have seen expressed in newspaper letters by kindred spirits I have never met: In general, arguments against physician assisted suicide are arguments for unassisted suicide; and, in particular, I have no intention of leaving it to anyone else to decide what kind of 'end days' I shall have--fate allowing me the chance to act on my own choice, of course. DWD Canada, to its credit no doubt, does not deal in this kind of melodrama.

Respectfully submitted: David Evans

I do not expect a reply, but I point out that I would receive a reply only if it comes from the same address I have used here to reach you.