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Nearly 30 years ago, Oregon passed the nation’s first law allowing terminally ill, mentally capable adults with a prognosis of six months or less to request a prescription for medication they can take to die peacefully. Currently, 10 states and Washington, D.C., have authorized this time-tested option of medical aid in dying, seven of these jurisdictions between 2015 and 2021.

These laws work; there has not been a single substantiated incident of coercion or abuse. With more than a quarter century of data since Oregon implemented its law and years of experience in 10 other authorized jurisdictions, we no longer have to hypothesize about what will happen if this medical practice is authorized. We know: Medical aid in dying protects patients, affords dying people autonomy and improves end-of-life care.

Furthermore, medical aid in dying is an option that Americans want. More than seven out of 10 support medical aid in dying, with majority support across virtually every demographic group. In addition, voters are eight times “more likely” (51%) than “less likely” (6%) to vote for a candidate that sponsors or supports medical aid-in-dying legislation according to a national survey conducted in 2021.¹

Lawmakers in authorized jurisdictions — who have seen firsthand the benefits of these laws — are successfully championing bills to improve their legislation. These improvements do not change the eligibility requirements; they simply recognize that the first medical aid-in-dying law (which most used as a model) included too many unnecessary regulatory roadblocks. With improvements, more dying patients are able to access the practice.

Of the 10 jurisdictions that have authorized medical aid in dying by statute so far, eight states, including Oregon, have passed laws that improve upon the original Oregon law. In each case, lawmakers maintained the necessary core safeguards and simply removed unhelpful barriers like lengthy waiting periods and residency requirements. In contrast, states that have not yet authorized medical aid in dying continue the same misinformed debate with sessions ending in stalemates and time-bound terminally ill patients suffering needlessly because of their inaction.

On behalf of our over half a million supporters, I urge you to let the data and strong public support for this end-of-life option guide your policymaking. If lawmakers in authorized jurisdictions have concluded through their direct experience that the original Oregon legislation is worthy enough to improve upon and still protect vulnerable populations, then the time has come to authorize medical aid in dying nationwide.

Sincerely,

Kim Callinan
President and CEO, Compassion & Choices

¹ Nationwide Poll Shows Strong Support for Advance Care-Dementia Planning, Medical Aid in Dying.
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Section I: Introduction

Compassion & Choices is the nation’s oldest, largest and most active nonprofit working to improve care, expand options and empower everyone to make informed decisions about their own end-of-life journey. For more than 40 years, Compassion & Choices and its sister organization, the Compassion & Choices Action Network, have worked nationwide to raise the voices of those nearing the end of life and to change attitudes, practices and policies so that everyone can access the full range of care options to direct and receive end-of-life healthcare that is consistent with their values and priorities. Compassion & Choices and our predecessor organizations have played a leadership role in significant advances to expand end-of-life autonomy here in the United States. As the leaders in this arena, we want to ensure that you have all of the necessary information to make an informed choice and take a proactive stance on medical aid in dying.

Medical aid in dying is the preferred term for the end-of-life care option by which a mentally capable, terminally ill adult with six months or less to live requests a prescription from their healthcare provider for medication that they can choose to self-ingest. Authorizing medical aid in dying provides terminally ill people with an additional end-of-life care option that may align with their values and priorities.

We recognize that medical aid in dying can seem like a complex issue, but with over 25 years of experience since the first such law was enacted in Oregon and decades of cumulative experience from the other authorized jurisdictions, this compassionate option has proven not only to protect patients, but to improve care across the end-of-life spectrum. This resource is intended to provide you with up-to-date, data-driven, research-based facts about medical aid in dying and to address the most common questions, concerns and hypothetical claims that we hear. It is offered in the spirit of partnership, and in the hope that we can build on the positive evidence and experience of the authorized jurisdictions to pass sound legislation.

Thank you for recognizing that this important nonpartisan issue deserves your attention. We look forward to the opportunity to assist you in helping to make monumental strides in the movement to give everyone access to the full range of end-of-life care options and be empowered to choose what works best for them.
Section II: Legislative Overview

Medical aid in dying refers to a practice in which a mentally capable, terminally ill adult may request a prescription from their healthcare provider for a medication that they can choose to ingest to die peacefully. The multi-step request process, strict eligibility criteria and other safeguards embedded in medical aid-in-dying laws ensure that anyone pursuing the option is protected.

Eligibility Criteria, Core Safeguards and Established Process

Each law authorizing medical aid in dying in the U.S. establishes strict eligibility criteria and practice requirements to ensure the highest standard of care, as described in the clinical criteria and guidelines published in the prestigious peer-reviewed Journal of Palliative Medicine. To be eligible for aid-in-dying medication, a person must be:

- An adult (aged 18 or older).
- Terminally ill with a prognosis of six months or less to live.
- Mentally capable of making their own healthcare decisions.
- Able to self-administer the medication through an affirmative, conscious, voluntary act to ingest it.
  - Self-administration does not include injection or infusion via a vein or any other parenteral route by any person, including the healthcare provider, family member or patient themselves.

Advanced age, disability and chronic health conditions are not qualifying factors for medical aid in dying.

In addition to the strict eligibility criteria, these laws include the following core safeguards:

- The attending healthcare provider must inform the terminally ill adult requesting medical aid in dying about all appropriate end-of-life care options. These other options include comfort care, hospice care, pain control and palliative care.
- The attending healthcare provider must inform the terminally ill adult requesting medical aid in dying that they can change their mind at any time, which includes deciding not to take the medication once they have obtained it.

---

These safeguards ensure that individual patient preferences, needs and values are honored and guide all clinical decisions, including the decision to use medical aid in dying.

Additional Statutory Requirements

The U.S. jurisdictions that have authorized medical aid in dying through legislation modeled their bills after Oregon’s Death With Dignity Act, with newer laws reflecting lessons learned in the movement. Jurisdictions’ regulatory and procedural requirements are slightly different, but each requires the following:

- The terminally ill adult must make at least one request to their attending healthcare provider.
- The written request must be witnessed by at least one person who cannot be a relative or someone who stands to benefit from the person’s estate upon their death.
- At least one healthcare provider must confirm the terminal diagnosis, prognosis of six months or less to live and the person’s ability to make an informed healthcare decision prior to the attending healthcare provider writing a prescription.
- If a healthcare provider suspects the individual has any condition that may be impairing their ability to make a rational informed healthcare decision, then the individual is required to undergo an additional mental capacity evaluation with a mental health professional (such as a psychiatrist, psychologist, licensed clinical social worker, psychiatric nurse practitioner or licensed clinical professional counselor).
- The request for aid-in-dying medication does not proceed unless the mental healthcare professional affirms that the individual is capable of making a rational and informed healthcare decision.

Voluntary Participation

The laws balance a patient’s need to receive the information they are requesting while also respecting and establishing clear boundaries for healthcare providers who are unwilling or unable to participate in the medical aid-in-dying process. Each law also specifically states healthcare provider participation is voluntary and that no provider is obligated to prescribe or dispense aid-in-dying medication. Further, federal law protects an individual’s right to transfer their medical records to an alternate provider if their regular healthcare provider(s) opt out or cannot support them in the care option. Generally, if the person requests that their healthcare provider transfer their medical records to an alternate healthcare provider, their healthcare provider is legally required to do so within a reasonable amount of time. Additionally, a healthcare provider must document the request for medical aid in dying in the patient’s record.

---

The laws ensure there is no risk for healthcare providers, providing explicit authorization for those who choose to participate (or not to participate) under the law. Both those qualified healthcare providers who choose to and those who choose not to participate in medical aid in dying are protected from criminal liability, civil liability and professional discipline, as long as they comply with the requirements set forth in the law and act in good faith while meeting the standards of medical care. Similar immunities and protections are extended to other healthcare providers (such as mental health professionals and pharmacists) and caregivers of the terminally ill person.

Criminal Conduct

While those who comply with all aspects of the law and meet the standard of care are provided immunity from certain criminal prosecution (e.g., homicide, assisting suicide or elder abuse) or civil lawsuits (such as malpractice), the jurisdictions retain the ability to hold those who fail to adhere to these strict requirements and medical care standards criminally and civilly liable. Moreover, the existing laws establish that any attempt to pressure or coerce someone to request or use medical aid in dying is a felony.
Section III: A Solid Body of Evidence

Support for medical aid in dying is growing. Researchers and legal scholars have confirmed that the experience across authorized jurisdictions puts to rest most of the arguments that opponents of authorization have made — or at least those that can be settled by empirical data. The most relevant data — namely, those relating to the traditional and more contemporary concerns that opponents of legalization have expressed — do not support and, in fact, dispel the concerns of opponents.4

Additionally, a 2022 sample of Colorado physicians showed that many are both willing and prepared to discuss medical aid in dying with patients and to provide referrals.5 A 2022 survey of nurses in the United States showed that personally 49% would support the concept of medical aid in dying and 57% professionally as a nurse.6 Furthermore, a 2023 national poll from Susquehanna Polling & Research showed that nearly 8 out of 10 of U.S. residents (79%) who self-identify as having a disability agree that medical aid in dying “should be legal for terminally ill, mentally capable adults who chose to self-ingest medication to die peacefully.”7

The evidence is clear: Medical aid-in-dying laws protect terminally ill individuals while giving them access to the full range of end-of-life options. The laws also provide appropriate legal protection for providers.

Medical Aid in Dying Protects Patients

There have been no substantiated incidents of abuse or coercion across the authorized jurisdictions since Oregon implemented the first medical aid-in-dying law on Oct. 27, 1997. A 2015 report from the Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law noted, “There appears to be no evidence to support the fear that [medical aid in dying] disproportionately affects vulnerable populations.” Vulnerable populations include the elderly, women, the uninsured, people with low educational status, the poor, the physically disabled or chronically

---

6 J Hosp Palliat Nurs. 2022 Feb 1. Nurses’ Values and Perspectives on Medical Aid in Dying: A Survey of Nurses in the United States. A cross-sectional electronic survey was sent to American Nurses Association nurse members; 2390 responded; 2043 complete data sets were used for analysis. Accessed at: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34840280/
ill, minors, people with psychiatric illnesses including depression, or racial or ethnic minorities, compared with background populations.8

Relatively Few Will Use Medical Aid in Dying, But Many Benefit From These Laws

The use of medical aid in dying accounts for less than 1% of annual deaths.9 That said, the laws benefit more than the small number of people who decide to use them. In the jurisdictions that have already authorized medical aid in dying, people report significant relief from worry about future physical and emotional pain just from knowing the option is there should they need it, regardless of whether or not they choose to pursue it.10 A 2022 article in the Journal of Palliative Care showed that access to medical aid in dying helped terminally ill people prepare for death and provided a sense of autonomy for their loved ones. Being able to support a patient’s wishes helped with the grieving process of those left behind.11

Medical Aid in Dying Improves End-of-Life Care

Oregon has long been on the forefront of end-of-life care, leading the nation in development of patient-directed practices, adherence to advance directives and hospice utilization. In fact, Oregon boasts among the highest number of people who die in their own homes rather than in hospitals.12 The experience and data demonstrate that the implementation and availability of medical aid in dying further promote these practices and improve other aspects of end-of-life care.13

> A 2001 survey of physicians about their efforts to improve end-of-life care following authorization of the Oregon Death With Dignity Act showed 30% of responding

---


physicians had increased the number of referrals they provided for hospice care, and 76% made efforts to improve their knowledge of pain management.¹⁴

> A 2015 Journal of Palliative Medicine study found that Oregon was the only state both in the highest quartile of overall hospice use and the lowest quartile for potentially concerning patterns of hospice use.¹⁵ “Concerning patterns of hospice use” is defined as very short enrollment, very long enrollment or disenrollment. This same study suggested its medical aid-in-dying law may have contributed to more open conversations between doctors and patients about end-of-life care options, which led to the more appropriate hospice use.

> Hospice programs across Oregon, in fact, reported an increase in referrals following passage of the Oregon Death With Dignity Act.¹⁶ Over 20 years later, more than 90% of those who used medical aid in dying were receiving hospice services at the time of their death.¹⁷

> Additionally, research shows that most patients who request medical aid in dying actively pursue palliative care, enroll in hospice and subsequently have good symptomatic relief.¹⁸

For Some, Comfort Care and Pain Management Are Not Enough to Relieve Suffering

Evidence from scientific studies confirms that despite the wide availability of hospice and palliative medicine, many patients experience pain at the end of life. One study found that the prevalence of pain increases significantly at the end of life, jumping from 26% of patients experiencing pain in the last 24 months of life to 46% in the last four months of life.¹⁹

Additionally, breakthrough pain — severe pain that occurs even when a patient is already medicated — remains a nightmare experience for many. In the National Breakthrough Pain Study, among respondents who had cancer (at all stages), 83.3% reported breakthrough pain.


¹⁶ Id.


For those cancer patients who experienced breakthrough pain, only 24.1% reported that using some form of pain management worked every time.\textsuperscript{20}

For some people the side effects of pain medication (sedation, nausea, obstructed bowels) are just as bad as the pain from the disease. Numerous agonies simply cannot be controlled or relieved unless a person is willing to be sedated to complete and deep unconsciousness. Even then, patients sometimes moan and grimace, suggesting pain may still be present. Many value their consciousness so highly that they bear extraordinary pain in order to be somewhat alert during their final days.

### People Decide to Use Medical Aid in Dying for Many Reasons

What we hear directly from terminally ill people is that they decide to use the law for multiple reasons all at once: pain and other symptoms such as breathlessness and nausea, loss of autonomy, and loss of dignity.\textsuperscript{21} It is not any one reason, but rather it is the totality of what happens to one’s body at the very end of life. For some people, the side effects of treatments such as chemotherapy or pain medication (sedation, relentless nausea, crushing fatigue, obstructed bowels, to name a few) are in addition to the agonizing symptoms of the disease. Others want the option of medical aid in dying so they can try that one last long-shot treatment with the peace of mind of knowing that if it results in unbearable suffering, they have a way to peacefully end it.

Our experience aligns with the years of data in Oregon and Washington, where doctors are asked to select from a pre-printed form the top reasons people decide to request aid-in-dying medication under the law. The most frequently reported end-of-life concerns for people in Oregon and Washington are loss of autonomy (87%), impaired quality of life (86%) and loss of dignity (69%).\textsuperscript{22}

The collective reasons total nearly 400%, which demonstrates that doctors are not selecting just one reason, but they are selecting multiple reasons.\textsuperscript{23} Incidentally, the Oregon annual report indicates that doctors believe 27% of patients requested this option because of concerns about inadequate pain control, whereas concerns about finances were only noted for 4.5% of patients.\textsuperscript{24}


\textsuperscript{23} Id.

Only the dying person can determine whether medical aid in dying is the right option for them. This law puts the decision in their hands, in consultation with their healthcare provider and those close to them, as it should be for such a deeply personal healthcare decision.

“...The last time I saw my partner, Jack, I could tell he was in so much pain despite the excellent hospice care he was receiving. I remember crying and Jack crying a little too. Jack was dying, imminently. There was no stopping that. But those final moments between us didn’t have to be wracked with pain. Jack could have avoided days of suffering if medical aid in dying were an option available to him. Instead, Jack suffered during his last days on earth. For what? I know that if I were in Jack’s shoes, with a terminal illness like cirrhosis of the liver, I would want the same option for myself. As someone living with a disability, I believe I should get to make my own decisions about what kind of medical care I receive when I reach the end of my life. No one else should get to make that decision.”

– Verna O’Brien, Illinois advocate for medical aid in dying

People Choose Medical Aid in Dying in Addition to Hospice and Palliative Care

Most people who request and obtain aid-in-dying medication are enrolled in hospice services at the time of their death.25

Good hospice services and palliative care do not eliminate the need for medical aid in dying. They are not mutually exclusive. Terminally ill people should have a full range of end-of-life options, whether disease-specific treatment, palliative care, refusal or administration of life-sustaining treatment, hospice care, or medical aid in dying. The option of medical aid in dying puts the decision-making power where it belongs: with the dying person.

Hospice and Palliative Care Use Among Those Who Request Medical Aid in Dying*

*This graph reflects data from all jurisdictions that report on hospice use. Currently, public health departments in nine authorized jurisdictions have issued reports regarding the use of medical aid-in-dying laws: Oregon, Washington, Vermont, California, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, Maine and New Jersey. More detailed reports can be provided upon request. Vermont, Washington, D.C., New Jersey, and Maine do not provide this data on hospice utilization in their reports on medical aid in dying. Montana authorized medical aid in dying through a court case, and a data report is not required by law.

Patients Involve Their Loved Ones in the Decision

The majority of eligible patients involve their family in their decision-making process,\textsuperscript{34} and most have someone (family and sometimes a trusted healthcare provider) present at some point during their planned death, according to the Oregon data.\textsuperscript{35}

Learnings Applied to Improve Access

The current Oregon model, which laid the foundation for all of the other authorized jurisdictions, requires a lengthy multistep process. It takes a dying person several weeks if not several months to get through all the steps, if they are able to complete it and obtain the prescription at all. In response to the evidence compiled across authorized jurisdictions, eight of the 10 states that have authorized legislation via statute have improved upon the original Oregon law in several ways: 1) reduced the waiting period, 2) expanded the type of providers who could participate to align with their scope of care (e.g. advanced practice registered nurses [APRNs] or physician assistants) 3) removed the residency requirement in recognition that medicine is often delivered across state lines. Please note, in all cases lawmakers have maintained the same strict eligibility criteria; the improvements simply ensure the original intention of the law was better realized. Below are more additional details on lessons learned.

What the Data Demonstrates

The empirical and anecdotal data from Oregon and the other authorized jurisdictions suggests that this process, as currently constructed, has too many regulatory roadblocks for many dying patients to access the law, as indicated by the following examples:

- A study by Kaiser Permanente Southern California showed that one-third of patients who requested the option of medical aid in dying were unable to complete the process and obtain a prescription before they died. It’s worth noting that Kaiser is a health system supportive of this practice, with dedicated patient navigators to assist people through the process.\textsuperscript{36}

- As mentioned previously, in the years since Oregon’s Death With Dignity Act passed, Disability Rights Oregon has received very few complaints from disabled Oregonians.

about it The executive director confirmed, “All of the complaints received have focused on the concern that the Act might discriminate against persons with disabilities who would seek to make use of the Act but have disabilities that would prevent self-administration … Disability Rights Oregon has never received a complaint that a person with disabilities was coerced or being coerced to make use of the Act.”37

> Between 2019 and 2021, Hawaii’s Department of Health’s annual reports to the Legislature repeatedly found that some of the well-intentioned regulatory requirements outlined in the state’s Our Care, Our Choice Act created unintended barriers for terminally ill patients. The latest report, from 2021, detailed that the 49 patients who died under the law endured an average waiting period of 41 days.38 As part of all three annual reports, the Department made two recommendations to the Legislature: (1) adopt an Oregon-style amendment allowing doctors to waive the waiting period for patients whose death is imminent; and (2) give APRNs the authority to serve as attending providers under the law.39

> At a National Academy of Sciences two-day assisted-death conference in 2018, many speakers — including physicians, ethicists and scholars — concluded that the biggest problem with the law was not one of abuse or coercion; it was that the process is just too cumbersome for patients to get through.39

Unfortunately, many people die while attempting to navigate an unnecessarily burdensome process. Several things contribute to this reality:

> Late enrollment in hospice. Many dying patients do not receive their six-month prognosis until they have far less than six months to live. One study of clinicians treating patients with advanced cancer found that only 41% of clinicians’ prognosis predictions were accurate, and of the inaccurate prognosis, 85% overestimated the length of time somebody would live.40

> Locating supportive and knowledgeable providers. Most of the laws in authorized jurisdictions explicitly allow healthcare systems and providers to opt out of offering this option. When an institution or health system opts out, it means that their providers are not able to practice medical aid in dying even if they want to. This restriction means any patient whose provider works at an institution that opts out will have to reestablish care in a supportive health system and find two supportive providers before they can begin

the process of qualifying for medical aid in dying. Additionally, a survey of advanced
practice professionals, a collective term that includes physician assistants (PAs) and
nurse practitioners, at Fred Hutch Cancer Center in fall 2021 showed that only 27% of
respondents stated that they were knowledgeable about medical aid in dying. The
authors found a positive association between knowledge or comfort regarding medical
aid in dying and willingness to participate in the procedure.41

Oppositional providers. In addition, anecdotal evidence shows that sometimes patients
are led to believe their doctor will “support” them when they become eligible under
the law, only to find out very late that supporting them means keeping them
comfortable in hospice care or referring them to another doctor without sufficient time
to navigate the process — not writing them the prescription.42 Some doctors who
personally object to the practice believe they should not have to transfer a patient’s
medical records or document requests, because they believe transferring records is
“participation” under the act, as is argued in a New Jersey lawsuit.43 Transferring
records and documentation, however, is part of standard medical care.44

Improvements to Laws in Authorized Jurisdictions

In response to the evidence compiled across the authorized jurisdictions, several have taken
action to reduce barriers while maintaining the same strict eligibility criteria:

Waiting Periods. The authorized jurisdictions are consistently recognizing that long waiting
periods result in unnecessary suffering for dying people.

- Based on years of practice, in 2019 the Oregon Legislature passed an important
amendment to its law to better balance safeguards intended to protect patients and
access to medical aid in dying. As long as a written request is provided and the
attending qualified clinician attests that the otherwise qualified patient is likely to die
while waiting, the amendment allows doctors to waive the 15-day waiting period
between the two required oral requests and the 48-hour waiting period if they
determine and attest that the patient is likely to die while waiting.45 The amendment
was a direct result of evidence and data that clearly demonstrated the need for easier
access for eligible terminally ill patients facing imminent death. The Oregon Health
Authority annual reports in the years after the amendment show that 20% (2020) and

41 From Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center: Assessment of willingness to provide medical aid in dying. From the
Loggers and Shen labs, Clinical Research Division:
https://compassionandchoices.org/docs/default-source/new-jersey/fourth-amended-verified-complaint-for-injunctive
-and-declaratory-relief.pdf
44 Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, Access of individuals to protected health information, 45 CFR
§ 164.524 (2022) Available from:
45 Senate Bill 579, 80th Oregon Legislative Assembly—2019 Regular Session. Available from:
21% (2021) of patients required a physician exemption in order to make it through the process.\(^{46}\)

- California recognized that waiting periods were posing an unnecessary barrier to terminally ill patients. In 2021, the Legislature amended the California End of Life Option Act to decrease the waiting period between the two oral requests from 15 days to 48 hours.\(^{47}\)
- New Mexico requires just one written request, so there is no waiting period related to requests. However, the law requires a 48-hour waiting period between receiving and filling a prescription for medical aid in dying medication, but allows a qualified clinician to waive the waiting period if a person is going to imminently die.\(^{48}\)
- In 2023, the Washington Legislature amended the state’s Death with Dignity Act to reduce the waiting period between a patient’s first and second oral request for the medication from 15 days to 7 days.\(^{49}\)
- In 2023, the Hawaii Legislature amended the Our Choice, Our Care Act to reduce the mandatory waiting period between the two oral requests required for a qualified patient to obtain a prescription for medication from 20 days to five days. It also allows providers to waive the mandatory minimum waiting period for terminally ill qualified patients who are not expected to survive the five-day waiting period.\(^{50}\)

**Residency Restrictions.** With the exception of Vermont and Oregon, every jurisdiction where medical aid in dying has been authorized via the legislative process limits the use of the practice to residents. Compassion & Choices believes that residency restrictions are unconstitutional, and we recommend that jurisdictions do not include residency requirements in their bills or laws. To date, the Oregon and Vermont attorneys general settled court cases challenging the constitutionality of their residency requirements, and the legislatures in both states have removed them from their laws.

**Qualified Healthcare Providers.** Authorized jurisdictions have expanded the types of healthcare providers who can serve as attending, consulting or mental health providers, which improves access for eligible patients.

- In 2023, Hawaii authorized qualified APRNs to be attending healthcare providers and authorized licensed APRNs and clinical nurse specialists with psychiatric or mental health qualifications to serve as the consulting or mental health provider, as well as to evaluate the patient’s mental competence.\(^{51}\)


health training and licensed marriage and family therapists to participate as mental health providers.\textsuperscript{51}

- In 2023, Washington authorized APRNs and PAs to act as either the attending or consulting medical provider for those who want to access the Death With Dignity Act. A physician would still have to be one of the other providers in either case. Additionally, Washington expanded the types of licensed mental health professionals who can participate as a mental healthcare provider to include independent clinical social workers, advanced social workers, mental health counselors and psychiatric advanced registered nurse practitioners.\textsuperscript{52}

- New Mexico allows APRNs and PAs to act as either the prescribing or consulting healthcare provider so long as a physician acts as the other provider. Additionally, New Mexico does not require confirmation of eligibility for medical aid in dying by a consulting provider if the person is enrolled in a medicare-certified hospice program. Master social workers, psychiatric nurse practitioners and professional clinical mental health counselors are also able to participate as mental health providers.\textsuperscript{53}

- In Vermont,\textsuperscript{54} New Jersey,\textsuperscript{55} and Maine\textsuperscript{56} clinical social workers are able to participate as mental health providers.

Some jurisdictions considering legislation are also weighing more streamlined approaches to reduce the burden on providers and terminally ill patients like ensuring greater clarity and transparency from healthcare providers and facilities.

\textsuperscript{51} Hawai’i House Bill 650 (signed June 1, 2023), available at https://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session/measure_indiv.aspx?billtype=HB&billnumber=650&year=2023
\textsuperscript{52} Washington State Legislature, Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5179 (April 6, 2023), available at https://lawfilesext.leg.wa.gov/biennium/2023-24/Pdf/Bills/Session%20Laws/Senate/5179-S.SL.pdf?q=202305100929
\textsuperscript{53} The Elizabeth Whitefield End-of-Life Options Act (2021), available at https://www.nmhealth.org/publication/view/general/8382
\textsuperscript{54} Vermont Patient Choice at End of Life, Chapter 113, available at https://legislature.vermont.gov/statutes/chapter/18/113
\textsuperscript{55} New Jersey Medical Aid in Dying for the Terminally Ill Act, Chapter 59 (April 12, 2019), available at https://pub.njleg.gov/bills/2018/PL19/59_HTM
\textsuperscript{56} Maine Death with Dignity Act, Public Law Chapter 271, available at https://legislature.maine.gov/legis/bills/bills_129th/chapters/PUBLIC271.asp
Section IV: Medical Aid-in-Dying Utilization Report

Currently, public health departments in nine authorized jurisdictions have issued reports regarding the use of medical aid-in-dying laws: Oregon, Washington, Vermont, California, Colorado, Hawai'i, the District of Columbia, Maine, and New Jersey. Compassion & Choices has compiled annual report data from the authorized jurisdictions that collect data. Key highlights include:

> In the past 25 years, starting with Oregon and across all jurisdictions that report data, just 8,729 people have ingested a prescription to end their suffering.67

> Less than 1% of the people who die in each jurisdiction use the law each year.68

> Only 63% (or just under 2/3) of people with prescriptions ingest the medication and die. Up to 37% of people who go through the process and obtain the prescription may never take it. This group consists of people who die from their underlying illness, another cause of death or an unreported cause of death. In any case, they derive peace

---

67 Id.
The majority of terminally ill people who use medical aid in dying (88%) received hospice and/or palliative care services at the time of their deaths, according to annual reports for which hospice data is available.

There is nearly equal use of medical aid in dying among men and women. There is currently no data on use of medical aid in dying by nonbinary or gender-nonconforming people.

Terminal cancer accounts for the vast majority of qualifying diagnoses, with neurodegenerative diseases such as ALS or Huntington’s disease following as the second-leading diagnosis.

Over 75% of people who use medical aid in dying are able to die at home, which is where most Americans would prefer to die, according to various studies.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Authorized Jurisdictions (1998 – 2022)</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who received prescriptions (prescriptions written or filled)</td>
<td>13,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who died after ingesting</td>
<td>8,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Native American/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous American, American Indian, Alaskan Native</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx, Hispanic</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-race (two or more racers)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white, Hispanic and/or Non-white</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Unknown</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9,149</td>
<td>92.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,859</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 – 64</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>23.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>31.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 – 84</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>27.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>17.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,891</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Breakdown (California)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 60</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>9.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 69</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>20.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 – 79</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>30.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 – 89</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>24.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>14.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma, GED, or Less</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>24.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>27.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's, Bachelor's, Master's, Doctorate or Professional Degree</td>
<td>4,691</td>
<td>47.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unenrolled</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9,907</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hospice and/or Palliative Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>88.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,753</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unenrolled</th>
<th>18.32%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,617</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Underlying Illness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unenrolled</th>
<th>69.65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,188</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Place of Death / Where Medication Ingested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unenrolled</th>
<th>75.63%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6,680</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Home</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Unknown</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>17.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,833</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provider Present at Ingestion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-provider type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending/Prescribing Provider</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>14.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Provider</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>23.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Provider and/or Volunteer</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>10.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td>48.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,910</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section V: The Truth About Medical Aid in Dying

When crafting medical aid-in-dying legislation, lawmakers can rely on the experience and knowledge from existing laws, research, patient perspectives and healthcare provider insight. We now have over 25 years of data since Oregon implemented its law in 1997 and years of experience from other authorized jurisdictions. None of the dire predictions that opponents raised have come to fruition. In fact, there has never been a single substantiated case of misuse or abuse of the laws. The evidence confirms that medical aid-in-dying laws protect patients while offering a much-needed option. The following section addresses the most common inaccurate claims about medical aid in dying and sets the record straight.

Medical Aid in Dying Is Not Euthanasia

Medical aid in dying is fundamentally different from euthanasia. Medical aid in dying is a practice by which a terminally ill, mentally capable person with a prognosis of six months or less chooses to request, obtain and take medication that brings about a peaceful death. In all authorized jurisdictions, only the dying person can request an aid-in-dying prescription under the law, and if and when they decide to ingest the medication, they must self-administer it. Therefore, control stays with the patient from beginning to end.

In contrast, euthanasia, sometimes called “mercy killing,” is an intentional act by which another person (not the dying person) acts to cause death. Euthanasia is illegal throughout the United States, and all medical aid-in-dying laws expressly prohibit euthanasia. Compassion & Choices does not support authorizing euthanasia because it would allow someone else — not the dying person — to cause the death of another.

Medical Aid in Dying Is Different From Suicide

The conflation — intentional or accidental — of medical aid in dying with suicide perpetuates false, harmful and stigmatizing information. Suicide is a public health and medical concern that requires collective efforts to address. Medical aid in dying is available only to terminally ill people who are mentally capable with a prognosis of six months or less to live. In fact, healthcare groups have concluded that medical aid in dying is distinct from suicide.75 Equating medical aid in dying with suicide is irresponsible and does a disservice both to dying people who want the option as well as those impacted by actual suicide.

75 UpToDate. (n.d.). UpToDate. https://www.uptodate.com/contents/medical-aid-in-dying-clinical-considerations/print (American Academy of Hospice and Palliative Medicine, the American Public Health Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Medical Women’s Association and the American Academy of Family Physicians)
Additionally, from a legal perspective the Oregon, Washington, Vermont, California, Colorado, Hawaii, New Jersey, Maine, New Mexico and District of Columbia laws emphasize with the same or similar language that: “Actions taken in accordance with [the Act] shall not, for any purpose, constitute suicide, assisted suicide, mercy killing or homicide, under the law.” Assisting a suicide remains a felony in jurisdictions where medical aid in dying is authorized. Saying “assisted suicide” inaccurately characterizes a legally authorized, legitimate medical practice as criminal activity under the law.

Opponents use the term “assisted suicide” in an attempt to discredit the legitimate practice of medical aid in dying. The American College of Legal Medicine filed an amicus brief before the United States Supreme Court in 1996 rejecting the term and adopted a resolution in 2008 in which they “publicly advocated the elimination of the word ‘suicide’ from the lexicon created by a mentally competent, though terminally ill, person who wishes to be aided in dying.”

(I will) go through any and all treatments in order to stay alive for as long as possible ... (but) there is nothing wrong with wanting to have as peaceful a transition as possible. The dying process doesn’t have to be painful. It doesn’t have to be filled with suffering if that’s not what the person wants. Death, if you are able to, should be something that you have some say in — whatever that is.”

– Susan Rahn, Mother, Breast Cancer Patient and Medical Aid-in-Dying Advocate

Medical Aid-in-Dying Laws Do Not Promote Suicide

There is no evidence that medical aid in dying impacts suicide rates, and it is a vast mischaracterization of suicide as a public health issue to blame the increase in death by suicide in a jurisdiction to medical aid in dying when there is no data or formal study that proves this.

There is no substantiated correlation between medical aid in dying and suicide. When medical aid in dying is authorized, it increases the likelihood that a terminally ill person will express their desire to end their life to a medical provider who has the training to evaluate them and connect them to appropriate care and support. Further, data shows that medical aid-in-dying laws improve end-of-life care in general and hospice and palliative care specifically. For example, Oregon’s medical aid-in-dying law has helped spur the state to lead the nation in hospice

---

enrollment, according to a report published in the New England Journal of Medicine. Additionally, according to Dr. Neil Wenger, director of the UCLA Health Ethics Center, the California medical aid-in-dying law “really has created a new standard for how we ought to be helping people at the end of life.”

**Availability of Medical Aid in Dying Is Not a Factor Used to Deny Treatment**

Medical aid in dying is only available to terminally ill individuals with a prognosis of six months or less to live. A research article from the New England Journal of Medicine concludes insurers have no financial incentive to pressure patients to accelerate their deaths because there are no substantial cost savings. The article was co-authored by an opponent of medical aid in dying more than 20 years ago, when use of hospice care was less frequent.

Furthermore, with the exception of New Mexico and Vermont, each of the laws in authorized jurisdictions explicitly state that the obligations created by wills, contracts, insurance and annuity policies cannot be affected by a terminally ill person’s decision to request or use medical aid in dying. In other words, people are entitled to their existing benefits regardless of whether they use medical aid in dying.

A 2018 study published in the Hastings Center Report noted, “Financial pressure is much more likely to influence a decision to pursue or reject aggressive life-extending care than it is to influence a request for physician assisted death.” No one wants to leave their family destitute trying to extend an inevitable and irreversible dying process, but both research and experience confirm that worry about finances is not one of the key motivating factors that lead someone to request medical aid in dying.

**Medical Aid in Dying Laws Protect Against Coercion**

All medical aid in dying laws make it a felony to coerce someone to request medical aid in dying. Additionally, healthcare providers do not receive additional reimbursement for supporting or prescribing medical aid in dying for their eligible patients.

---

Family Members Have No Incentive to Coerce Terminally Ill Loved Ones

There have been no reports of family members coercing a terminally ill person to use medical aid in dying in the over 25 years that such laws have been in effect. In addition, a person who uses medical aid in dying is already expected to die within six months. Furthermore, when faced with the prospect of losing a loved one, family members and caregivers are far more likely to cling to patients in late-stage illness and demand that all measures be taken to prolong life.\(^1\) A large U.S. comprehensive cancer hospital study analyzing decision-making in lung cancer patients and caregivers reported that 65% of caregivers experienced treatment disagreements. The same study revealed that families and caregivers were less likely to agree with patient choices regarding decisions to discontinue therapeutic treatments or do not attempt resuscitation (DNAR) status.\(^2\) Another study found that five primary themes identified as protective factors for negative bereavement outcomes. The five factors included preparedness for death, place of death, sense of control and autonomy, reduction in suffering/burden, and being able to support the patient’s end-of-life wishes.\(^3\) Medical aid in dying offers the opportunity for those protective factors to be part of the end-of-life experience.

Patients Have Various Options for Ingesting the Medication

The type and dosage of aid-in-dying medication the qualified prescriber or healthcare provider prescribes can vary. Just like there is not just one blood pressure medicine, there is not just one medication for aid in dying. Historically, prescriptions for aid in dying involved three separate medications: two to speed absorption and prevent nausea followed by a short-acting barbiturate. However, as science and technology continue to advance, and due to market-driven variations in the cost and availability of drugs over time, several medications and combinations of medications have been developed and are now successfully used in aid-in-dying prescriptions. The currently recommended aid-in-dying pharmacology is a mixture of digoxin, digitalis, morphine sulfate, amitriptyline and phenobarbital.\(^4\)

---


In practice, the medication is provided as a powder and mixed together with approximately 2-4 ounces of liquid and ingested by the terminally ill person.

Once the prescription has been filled, the terminally ill person can choose when to take the medication, which causes deep sleep usually within 3-10 minutes. Respiration slows over the course of an hour or two, then stops, and the person dies peacefully in their sleep. According to the American Clinicians Academy on Medical Aid in Dying (ACAMAID), 85% die within two hours of medication ingestion. 85 Injection or infusion via a vein or any other parenteral route of aid-in-dying medication by any person, including the doctor, family member or patient themselves, is explicitly prohibited in each of the laws.

**Medical Aid-in-Dying Medication Is Safe**

There is little chance of an accidental overdose attributable to aid-in-dying medication — far less of a chance than many over the counter medications. The medication requires a high dosage to work and is bitter to the point of near intolerance (particularly without the preparatory medication). One is far more likely to overdose on common over-the-counter medications like cough syrup or the many potentially lethal medications one is often prescribed at the end of life, such as morphine.

In instances when aid-in-dying medication is dispensed but remains unused when the person dies, medication is to be disposed of according to guidelines established by the Drug Enforcement Agency and as required under state statute. 86 Information on how to dispose of medication can be found on the DEA website or on The National Association of Boards of Pharmacy website. 87

If hospice is involved, they can dispose of it just as they do with all unused sedatives and pain medications, many of which are also potent and hazardous controlled substances. If hospice is not involved, pharmacists often ask that unused opioids and sedatives be returned to them or a state-approved prescription drug take-back program for disposal.

---

The Death Certificate Protocol for Medical Aid in Dying Is Consistent With Other End-of-Life Options

Death certificates for medical aid in dying are filled out to comply with guidelines provided by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). When a terminally ill person dies using medical aid in dying, the underlying terminal disease (e.g., cancer, ALS) is listed as the cause of death. It is critical to list the disease that caused the death and not the mechanism, as the purpose of the death certificate is to track and understand trends in diseases. As an example, if a person has a stroke and is put on a ventilator that is subsequently removed, the doctor lists “stroke” as the cause of death, not “disconnecting the ventilator” or “suffocation.” Likewise, when palliative sedation is administered by a doctor to a person with cancer, the cause of death is listed as cancer and not a “physician-administered drug overdose.”

Because public health officials use death certificates to compile data on various statistics, including leading causes of death, and report that data to the National Center for Health Statistics based upon the International Classification of Diseases (ICD), it is essential that the doctors list the underlying terminal disease. Listing medical aid in dying — or suicide — rather than the underlying terminal disease is in violation of CDC guidelines, would sabotage the purpose of death certificates and would skew data collection designed to improve healthcare. Doctors willing to provide medical aid in dying understand this distinction. Those people who feel that medical aid in dying conflicts with their personal values and beliefs are not required to participate in the practice.

---

Section VI: The Growing Movement

In recent years, public support and demand for this end-of-life care option has grown. As a result, the medical community and lawmakers are recognizing the value and importance of expanding end-of-life options by dropping their opposition, adopting supportive policies and passing laws to authorize the practice. During the 2022–23 legislative session, 358 bi-partison sponsors or co-sponsors introduced 38 bills to authorize or improve medical aid in dying in 21 states. These bills were proposed in every region of the country. Six states and Washington, D.C., have authorized medical aid in dying in the last seven years. In contrast, it took 19 years for the first four states to authorize this option. The movement’s momentum is evident.

Public Support for Medical Aid in Dying as an End-of-Life Care Option

Numerous public opinion polls from a variety of sources, both nationally and at the state level, demonstrate that Americans consistently support medical aid in dying, with majority support among nearly every demographic group.89 A 2023 nationwide poll by Susquehanna Polling & Research reported that nearly eight out of 10 of U.S. residents (79%) who self-identify as having a disability agree that “medical aid in dying (MAID) should be legal for terminally ill, mentally capable adults who chose to self-ingest medication to die peacefully.”90 A 2021 nationwide poll by Susquehanna Polling & Research reported that 68% of voters support medical aid in dying as an end-of-life care option. Additionally, when respondents are asked if they want the option of medical aid in dying personally for themselves, 67% said yes.91 Gallup’s 2020 Values and Beliefs poll shows that a majority of respondents have consistently favored medical aid in dying since Gallup first asked about it in 1996.92

Majority Support Among Diverse Groups

In addition to the medical and other organizations that have endorsed medical aid in dying noted above, the Coalition for Liberty and Justice, the Older Women’s League93 and SAGE,94 a national organization that provides services and advocacy for LGBT elders, have all endorsed

94 Id.
medical aid in dying on a national level. Broad support spans nearly every demographic, from age to ethnic group and from religious to political affiliation.\textsuperscript{95}

Six national Latino/a/x organizations have adopted supportive policies on medical aid in dying:

- Dolores Huerta Foundation\textsuperscript{96}
- Hispanic Health Network\textsuperscript{97}
- Latino Commission on AIDS\textsuperscript{98}
- Latinos for Healthcare Equity\textsuperscript{99}
- National Hispanic Council on Aging\textsuperscript{100}
- Nuestra Salud\textsuperscript{101}

These endorsements have all come in the past four years and represent a growing recognition that Latino/a/x (Hispanic) constituents support this option and that the laws, as written, protect vulnerable patients.

Additionally, Samuel DeWitt Proctor Conference, Inc., whose mission is to nurture, sustain and mobilize the African American faith community in collaboration with civic, corporate and philanthropic leaders to address critical needs of human rights and social justice within local, national and global communities issued a statement of support for medical aid in dying.\textsuperscript{102}


\textsuperscript{99} Id.

\textsuperscript{100} All Americans should have access to all end-of-life care options. National Hispanic Council on Aging, Yanira Cruz, Guest Column Op-Ed, The Hill, October 28, 2017. Available from: https://thehill.com/opinion/healthcare/357575-all-americans-should-have-access-to-all-end-of-life-care-options

\textsuperscript{101} My father-in-law wanted end-of-life care options. We all should have them. María Otero, Co-Founder, Nuestra Salud, Guest Column Op-Ed, Albuquerque Journal, May 13, 2018. Available from: https://www.abqjournal.com/1717348/my-fatherinlaw-wanted-endoflife-care-options-we-all-should-have-them.html

Furthermore, prominent leaders in the African American community are endorsing medical aid in dying. In 2016, medical aid in dying was authorized in Washington, D.C., with the support of all but one member of the predominantly Black city council and a Black mayor.\textsuperscript{103} Supporters include the late Maryland Congressman Elijah Cummings,\textsuperscript{104} the first African American to be named speaker pro tem in the Maryland House of Delegates; and Maryland Congressman Anthony G. Brown,\textsuperscript{105} formerly Maryland’s lieutenant governor. In addition, Dr. Benjamin F. Chavis,\textsuperscript{106} president and CEO of the National Newspaper Publishers Association; and Dr. Jeff Gardere,\textsuperscript{107} famed psychologist and ordained minister, publicly endorse and advocate for medical aid in dying.

“I have experienced the loss of far too many people ... some of whom suffered for months knowing they were about to die,” wrote Rep. Cummings in a letter.\textsuperscript{108} “[T]here are those among us whose conscience can never accept that any person should have the right to choose the manner and timing of their passing [but] at the end of life, an individual’s right to self-determination about one of the most personal decisions that anyone could make supersedes the moral sensibilities of others.”

\begin{quote}
Dying is part of life ... And since dying is part of life, talking about it shouldn’t be taboo. People should die a decent death. For me that means having had the conversations with those I have crossed in life and being at peace. It means being able to say goodbye to loved ones — if possible, at home.”

– Archbishop Desmond Tutu
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Dr. Jeff Gardere and Jennifer Milch: “Stop Needless Suffering. Pass the Medical Aid in Dying Act.”} (2021). Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SJBV_6n5WLQ&ab_channel=CompassionChoices

Medical Ethical Considerations

Among U.S. physicians, support for medical aid in dying is also strong. A 2020 Medscape poll of 5,130 U.S. physicians from 30 specialties demonstrated a significant increase in support for medical aid in dying from 2010. A 2021 Gynecologic Oncology survey showed 69% of respondents believed that medical aid in dying should be legalized, and in a 2020 Oncology Ethics report, 55% of oncologists surveyed said that medical aid in dying should be legalized. A 2022 study of Colorado physicians noted “those who have participated in [medical aid in dying] largely report the experience to be emotionally fulfilling and professionally rewarding,” despite barriers to offering the end-of-life care option. And 55% of physicians surveyed endorse the idea of medical aid in dying, agreeing that “Physician assisted death should be allowed for terminally ill patients.”

Additionally, a 2022 survey of nurses demonstrated that most nurses would care for a patient contemplating medical aid in dying (86%) and that 57% would support the concept of medical aid in dying professionally as a nurse.

Over the past six years, dozens of national and state medical and professional associations have endorsed or dropped their opposition to medical aid in dying in response to growing support for this option among qualified clinicians and the public.

Six national health organizations have taken positions supporting medical aid in dying:

> American College of Legal Medicine
> American Medical Student Association

---

Because provider participation is critical to access medical aid in dying, lawmakers look to healthcare associations for input. Neutral positions, including engaged neutrality, recognize differences of opinion among providers and establish that those who participate in medical aid in dying are adhering to their professional ethical obligations, as are those who decline to participate. Six national healthcare organizations have adopted neutral positions:

- American Medical Women's Association
- American Public Health Association
- GLMA: Healthcare Professionals Advancing LGBT Equality
- National Student Nurses' Association
- American Academy of Family Physicians
- American Academy of Neurology
- American Academy of Hospice and Palliative Medicine
- American Nurses Association
- American Pharmacists Association
- American Psychological Association
- American Society of Health-System Pharmacists

---


125 American Psychological Association. (2017, August). Resolution on Assisted Dying and Justification. https://www.apa.org/about/policy/assisted-dying-resolution#:%3Ftext=The%20APA%20Resolution%20on%20Assisted%0D%02C%20end%3D%3C%3E&text=to%20considerations%20on%20assisted%20dying.

Medical associations in many of the authorized jurisdictions currently have neutral positions on medical aid in dying, including Oregon,129 California,130 Colorado,131 District of Columbia,132 Vermont,133 Hawaii,134 Maine,135 and New Mexico.136 At least nine other state medical societies and a component society in non-authorized jurisdictions have also recently dropped their opposition: New York,137 Connecticut,138 Illinois,139 Maryland,140 Massachusetts,141 Minnesota,142 Nevada,143 Delaware 144 and Virginia.145.

127 National Association of Social Workers, NASW Standards for Palliative and End of Life Care, Available from: https://www.socialworkers.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=xBMd58VwEhk%3D&portalid=0


Additionally, the American Medical Association (AMA) and the National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization (NHPCO) have amended their policies to state that it is ethical for a provider to provide medical aid in dying to qualified patients seeking it.\textsuperscript{146} The NHPCO even went so far as to replace the outdated and pejorative expression “assisted suicide” with the correct terminology “medical aid in dying.”\textsuperscript{147} While the AMA and NHPCO do not yet have a fully supportive policy, these changes are a significant step forward and demonstrate that acceptance within the medical field is increasing.

There is growing recognition within the healthcare field that patients want, need and deserve access to medical aid in dying. As more jurisdictions authorize medical aid in dying, the healthcare community is coming together, and providers are sharing their experiences and fine-tuning their collaborative efforts to better serve dying patients.

Support From State Organizations

Because this issue is primarily being advanced at the state level, often it is state — not national — organizations that take a position. At the state level, we enjoy support or engaged neutrality from hundreds of organizations. When organizations have a position of engaged neutrality, they have decided to not oppose medical aid in dying. Rather, their membership base has chosen to continue considering and developing their position on the matter for the time being. This support varies significantly by jurisdiction and grows weekly but includes:

- Bar Associations – California,\textsuperscript{148} Connecticut\textsuperscript{149}
- American Civil Liberties Union – Connecticut,\textsuperscript{150} New Jersey,\textsuperscript{151} New Mexico,\textsuperscript{152} New York\textsuperscript{153}


> Disability Rights Organizations – Disability Rights Montana,154 Disability Rights New Mexico,155 The Arc New York156 Utah157
>
> LGBTQ+ organizations – Equality Federation California158, Gay and Lesbian Activist Alliance – D.C.159

> League of Women Voters – Maryland,160 New York,161 Utah162

> National Association of Social Workers – California,163 Massachusetts,164 New Jersey,165 New Mexico166

> Faith Groups – United Church of Christ / Central Atlantic Conference (D.C., Delaware, New Jersey, Maryland),167 United Methodist Church / California-Pacific,168 Unitarian

Impact of Public Political Support

As noted above, public opinion data demonstrates wide support for medical aid in dying, and voters are rewarding lawmakers who advance this compassionate end-of-life care option by reelecting them. More than seven out of 10 Americans support medical aid in dying with majority support across virtually every demographic group. In addition, voters are eight times “more likely” (51%) than “less likely” (6%) to vote for a candidate for the state legislature if they sponsor or support medical aid-in-dying legislation, according to a national survey conducted by Susquehanna Polling & Research in 2021. The reelection rate for bill sponsors in 2018 was 92%; it increased to 95% in 2020 and held steady at 95% for 2022. Of the 337 sponsors and co-sponsors of medical aid-in-dying bills who sought reelection in 2022, 93% won, retaining their seats.

---


170 Unitarian Universalist Church, Maryland, Statement of Support for Medical Aid in Dying (2019). Available from: https://www.uulmmd.org/death-with-dignity


Section VII: About Compassion & Choices

Compassion & Choices is the oldest and largest national nonprofit organization committed to improving care, expanding options and empowering everyone to chart their end-of-life journey. We have more than a half a million supporters and 7,200 volunteers nationwide.

In our last fiscal year, our C34 and C4 secured nearly $25 million dollars in revenue, with an operating budget of about the same size. Our funding comes almost exclusively from the generosity of individuals and family foundations, with 85,000 active donors. We receive virtually no corporate support, with the exception of pro bono services provided by law firms that litigate court cases to advance our mission. We are a grassroots movement, the progress of which is the result of people experiencing unnecessary suffering at life’s end, demanding care and seeking policies that better reflect their values and priorities.

Section VIII: Conclusion

Authorizing the full range of end-of-life options including medical aid in dying allows people to engage in open conversations with their healthcare providers, their loved ones and their faith leaders about their physical and spiritual needs at the end of life. Without the authorization of medical aid in dying, people nearing the end of life are unable to access this compassionate practice without traveling to another jurisdiction.

We now have over 25 years of experience since the first such law was enacted in Oregon demonstrating that medical aid-in-dying laws provide an additional end-of-life option for many constituents, while also protecting patients. Allowing this legislation to become law brings peace of mind to terminally ill people at or near the end of their lives and their community. Furthermore, the cost of inaction is high.

Terminally ill people:

- May not try that one last miracle treatment out of fear it will be too painful.
- Need the peace of mind that having access to the full range of end of life options provides.
- Could experience needless agony when they die, while families and healthcare providers remain powerless with no legal way to respond to pleas for help.

Furthermore, society also fails to gain from the benefits that occur with medical aid in dying implementation including:

- Better conversations between providers and patients.
- Better palliative care training.
- Better hospice usage.
- More open conversations and essential planning for the end of life.

Your jurisdiction can realize these benefits for terminally ill people and their families right now by joining the growing number of jurisdictions that authorize this end-of-life option.

The debate quite simply comes down to who decides and who is in a better position to determine the care a patient receives at the end of life: the terminally ill patient in consultation with their provider and loved ones, or the government?

We urge you to review the evidence, experience, data and strong public support for this end-of-life care option to guide your policymaking.