

Medical Aid in Dying: A Policy to Improve Care and Expand Options at Life's End

2021 Edition



December 2020

Dear Lawmaker,

Twenty-seven years ago, in November 1994, Oregon passed the nation's first law allowing mentally capable terminally ill adults to have the end-of-life care option of medical aid in dying to peacefully end unbearable suffering. Since that time, much has changed. Medicine has made extraordinary advances resulting in improved health and longevity, for which we are all grateful; however, the very practices and medications designed to save lives sometimes prolong suffering.

This year, the COVID public health emergency brought about a deeper understanding of the fragility of our lives, the tragedy of loved ones dying alone without the care and comfort of loved ones, and the limits of modern medicine to relieve suffering at life's end. It has reinforced the need for state lawmakers to pass medical aid-in-dying legislation so terminally ill residents can choose, if they want, to die peacefully, at home, surrounded by their loved ones.

Nine states and Washington, D.C., have authorized the compassionate option of medical aid in dying. Six of these jurisdictions authorized this end-of-life care option within the past six years (2015-2020).

We now have 23 years of experience since the first law was enacted in Oregon, and an additional 40+ years of combined evidence from the laws passed in other jurisdictions. We no longer have to hypothesize about what will happen if this medical practice is authorized. The evidence is clear: medical aid in dying protects patients, affords dying people autonomy and compassion during the most difficult time, improves end-of-life care, and costs states almost nothing to implement.

On behalf of our hundreds of thousands of supporters across the country, I urge you to let the evidence, data and strong public support for this end-of-life care option guide your policymaking and authorize medical aid in dying this year.

Terminally ill residents don't have the luxury of endless deliberations; they need the relief that this law affords them right now. Not a single additional person will die if you authorize medical aid in dying, but fewer will suffer.

Sincerely,



Kim Callinan
President and CEO

Compassion & Choices
Compassion & Choices Action Network

Table of Contents

Section I: Introduction	1
Section II: Legislative Overview	2
Eligibility Criteria, Core Safeguards and Established Process	2
Additional Legislated Requirements	3
Voluntary Participation	3
Criminal Conduct	4
Section III: A Solid Body of Evidence	5
Medical Aid in Dying Protects Patients	5
Relatively Few Will Use Medical Aid in Dying, But Many Benefit From These Laws	5
Medical Aid in Dying Improves End-of-Life Care	6
For Some, Comfort Care and Pain Management Are Not Enough to Relieve Suffering	7
People Decide to Use Medical Aid in Dying to Relieve Suffering	7
People Choose Medical Aid in Dying as well as Hospice and Palliative Care	8
Hospice and Palliative Care Utilization Among Those Who Request Medical Aid in Dying	9
Patients Involve Their Family in the Decision	9
The Oregon Model Has Too Many — Not Too Few — Regulatory Restrictions	9
Section IV: State Reports on Utilization	14
All Authorized Jurisdictions	14
Cumulative	14
Section V: The Truth About Medical Aid in Dying	18
Medical Aid in Dying Is Not Euthanasia	18
Medical Aid in Dying Is Not Suicide	19
Medical Aid-in-Dying Laws Do Not Promote Suicide	20
Insurance Companies Do Not Deny Treatment Because Medical Aid in Dying Is an Available End-of-Life Option	20
Providers Do Not Have an Incentive to Coerce Patients	21
Family Members Do Not Have an Incentive to Coerce Terminally Ill Loved Ones	21
Patients Have Various Options for Taking the Medication	22
Accidental Overdose by a Third Party Has Never Happened and Is Highly Unlikely	22
Medical Aid-in-Dying Medication Is Safely Disposed of	22
The Protocol Used for Death Certificates for Medical Aid in Dying Is Consistent With Other End-of-Life Options	23
Section VI: The Growing Movement	24
Public Support for Medical Aid in Dying as an End-of-Life Care Option	24
Majority Support Among Diverse Groups	24

Medical Ethical Considerations	25
Support From Other Organizations	26
Impact of Public Political Support	27
Section VII: About Compassion & Choices	28
Section VIII: Conclusion	29
References	30

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 chart their own end-of-life journey. For more than 40 years, Compassion & Choices and its sister organization, Compassion & Choices Action Network, we have worked across the nation to raise the voices of those nearing the end of life, to change attitudes, practices and policies so that everyone can access the information and full range of care options to have greater autonomy and comfort at the end of life. Compassion & Choices and our predecessor organizations have played a leadership role in most of the significant advances to expand end-of-life autonomy here in the United States. As the thought leaders in this arena, we want to ensure that you have all of the necessary information to make an informed decision and take a proactive stance about medical aid in dying.

We recognize that medical aid in dying can seem like a complex issue, but with 23 years of experience from Oregon alone and another 40+ years of combined evidence in the other authorized jurisdictions, the laws that authorize this compassionate option have 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, patient-driven facts about medical aid in dying and to address the most common questions, concerns and hypothetical claims that we hear across the nation. 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 by passing evidence-based legislation in your state.

We thank you for recognizing that this popular non-partisan issue deserves your attention and look forward to the opportunity to assist you in helping to make monumental strides in the fight for patient autonomy at the end of life.

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 medical provider for a medication that they can choose to take to die peacefully if their suffering becomes unbearable. The fundamental core safeguards embedded in medical aid-in-dying laws ensure that all terminally ill individuals pursuing the option are protected from coercion and abuse.

Eligibility Criteria, Core Safeguards and Established Process

Each of the laws 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*.¹ To be eligible for aid-in-dying medication, an individual 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; and
- > Able to self-administer the medication through an affirmative, conscious, voluntary act to ingest the prescribed medication to bring about the individual's peaceful death.
 - Self-administration does not include administration by intravenous (IV) or other parenteral injection or infusion by any person, including the doctor, 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 establish the following core safeguards:

- > The attending medical provider must inform the terminally ill adult requesting medical aid in dying about all other end-of-life care options. These other options include comfort care, hospice care, pain control and palliative care;
- > The attending medical provider must inform the terminally ill adult requesting medical aid in dying that they can change their mind at any time. This patient right to change their mind includes deciding not to take the medication once they have obtained it;
- > The attending medical provider must also offer the individual an opportunity to rescind their request.

These core 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 Legislated Requirements

The U.S. jurisdictions that have authorized medical aid in dying through legislation modeled their bills after Oregon's Death With Dignity Act. Each state's regulatory and procedural requirements are slightly different, but each requires that:

- > The terminally ill adult must make multiple requests to their attending medical provider, including at least one oral request and one written request.
- > The written request must be witnessed by two people, one of whom can't be a relative or someone who stands to benefit from the person's estate upon their death.

Further, a consulting medical 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 medical provider writing a prescription. If either the attending or consulting medical 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 free of any mental condition causing impaired judgment and is capable of making a rational and informed healthcare decision.

Voluntary Participation

Each of the laws also ensure that individual healthcare providers' values and beliefs are respected; they specifically state participation is voluntary and that no provider is obligated to prescribe or dispense aid-in-dying medication. However, the professional duty of non-abandonment suggests if a provider is unable or unwilling to honor a patient's request, they should promptly refer a requesting individual to another provider so they can access the care they want and need.² Further, the laws require that if the patient transfers their care to a new provider, the prior provider must promptly transfer a copy of the patient's relevant medical records to the new provider.

The laws provide explicit authorization for physicians to participate in the practice of medical aid in dying and protect those who do participate 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 (end-of-life) care. Similar immunities and protections are extended to oth

er healthcare providers (such as mental health professionals as well as pharmacists) and caregivers involved in the care of the terminally ill individual.

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 (for example, homicide, assisting suicide or elder abuse) or civil lawsuits (such as malpractice), the states retain the ability to hold those who fail to adhere to these strict requirements criminally and civilly liable.

Moreover, the existing laws establish that any attempt to pressure or coerce an individual to request or use medical aid in dying is a felony.

Section III: A Solid Body of Evidence

The growing support for medical aid in dying is attributable, in part, to the fact that it is a proven and time-tested end-of-life care option. Researchers and legal scholars have confirmed that the experience across the 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.”³

The evidence is clear: medical aid-in-dying laws protect terminally ill individuals, while giving them a compassionate option to die peacefully and providing appropriate legal protection for the providers who practice this patient-driven option.

Medical Aid in Dying Protects Patients

There have been no documented or substantiated incidents of abuse or coercion across the authorized jurisdictions since Oregon implemented the first medical aid-in-dying law on Oct. 27, 1997. In 2008, the *Journal of Medical Ethics* concluded that: “Rates of assisted dying in Oregon ... showed no evidence of heightened risk for the elderly, women, the uninsured ... people with low educational status, the poor, the physically disabled or chronically ill ... people with psychiatric illnesses including depression, or racial or ethnic minorities, compared with background populations.”⁴

More recently, the Disability Rights Oregon executive director has confirmed that: “Disability Rights Oregon has never to my knowledge received a complaint that a person with disabilities was coerced or being coerced to make use of the Act.”⁵

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

Based on data from the jurisdictions that have authorized medical aid in dying and subsequently published statistical reports, less than 1% of people who die annually in an authorized jurisdiction will decide to use the law, but large numbers will benefit from simply knowing the law exists.

Awareness of the law has a palliative effect, relieving worry about end-of-life suffering. About one-third of terminally ill adults who have received an aid-in-dying prescription in Oregon since its Death with Dignity law took effect in 1997 never took the medication. However, they report experiencing enormous relief from the moment they obtained the prescription because it alleviated their fears of suffering.⁶ Quite simply, medical aid in dying is a prescription for comfort and peace of mind.

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 terms of the 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.⁷ 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.

- > A 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.⁸
- > A 2015 Journal of Palliative Medicine study found that in addition to having one of the highest rates of hospice use, Oregon had the lowest rate of inappropriate hospice use.⁹ “Inappropriate hospice use” is defined as very short enrollment, very long enrollment or disenrollment. This same study suggested the 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 did, in fact, report an increase in referrals following passage of the Oregon Death With Dignity Act.¹⁰ Over 20 years later, more than 90% of individuals who used medical aid in dying were receiving hospice services at the time of their death¹¹

“ The (California) End of Life Options Act has really has created a new standard for how we ought to be helping people at the end of life.”¹²

– Dr. Neil Wenger, director of the UCLA Health Ethics Center

On January 24, 2018, just over a year and a half after the California law went into effect, the Assembly Select Committee on End of Life Health Care (California Select Committee) held a hearing on the implementation status. The testimony from patients, doctors and health system representatives echoed Dr. Wenger’s sentiments: that although the regulatory process was more complicated and burdensome than anticipated, the law has been compassionately implemented, promoted better end-of-life care and provides peace of mind to countless Californians nearing their final days. This message was echoed during the California Select Committee’s second hearing on February 25, 2020.

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

The evidence from scientific studies confirms that despite the wide availability of hospice, palliative care and pain management, up to 51% of patients experience pain at the end of life. The prevalence of pain has been noted to increase significantly in the last four months of life, reaching as high as 60% in the last month of life.^{13,14}

Additionally, breakthrough pain — severe pain that erupts even when a patient is already medicated — remains a nightmare experience for many patients. It has been estimated that between 65% and 85% of patients with cancer — by far the most common disease among people who request medical aid in dying — experience significant pain.¹⁵

For some people the side effects of pain medication (sedation, nausea, obstructed bowels) are just as bad as the pain from the disease. Some 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.

While pain is less frequently noted in the Oregon data as a reason terminally ill adults request the option of medical aid in dying, this aberration is likely because the doctor, not the patient, fills out the report. Studies suggest that doctors often underestimate pain levels.¹⁶

People Decide to Use Medical Aid in Dying to Relieve Suffering

What we hear directly from terminally ill individuals is that people 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. 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 just as bad as the agonizing symptoms of the disease. For others, they want the option of medical aid in dying because they want to try that one last, long-shot treatment with the peace of mind of knowing that if it results in unbearable suffering, they have an option to peacefully end it.

Our experience is consistent with the years of data in Oregon,¹¹ where doctors are asked to select from a pre-printed form the top reasons people decide to request the medication under the law. The most frequently reported end-of-life concerns are consistently decreasing ability to participate in activities that made life enjoyable (90%), loss of autonomy (87%), and loss of dignity (72%).

The collective reasons total nearly 400%, which demonstrates that doctors are not selecting just one reason, but they are selecting multiple reasons. Further evidence that it is the totality

of the experience of dying — all of which constitute forms of suffering at the end of life — that motivates a dying person to use this option. Suffering by itself is not one of the available options for doctors to select. Incidentally, the Oregon annual report indicates that doctors believe that 33% of patients requested this option because of concerns about inadequate pain control, whereas concerns about finances were only noted for 7% of patients.

Only the dying person can determine how much pain and suffering is too much. This law puts the decision in the hands of the dying person, in consultation with their doctor and loved ones, as it should be for such a deeply personal healthcare decision.

“ As you can imagine, after 54 years together, the thought of losing him was just awful. We had talked about how we felt about long-term suffering and promised each other that we would not let that happen. But I knew I couldn't help him to go quickly. And the doctor made it plain — though he was very kind and understanding — that there was nothing he could do ... I thought, 'Oh dear God, I just can't bear this. I can't stand the thought of him having to go through this.' But he was so brave. When I came in a day later, he said, 'I did not have any food or water this morning. I have decided to begin the long glide,' as he called it. It took 10 full days for him to die, which is why I am so in favor of the goals of Compassion & Choices.”


– Diane Rehm, host of “The Diane Rehm Show” on WAMU, Peabody Award-winning National Public Radio Host

People Choose Medical Aid in Dying as well as Hospice and Palliative Care

Terminally ill people who request medical aid in dying do not request it because hospice or palliative care has failed to control their symptoms. In fact, the vast majority of individuals who use medical aid in dying are also receiving hospice and palliative care.

Good hospice services and palliative care do not eliminate the need for medical aid in dying as an end-of-life care option. Terminally ill people should have a full range of end-of-life care options, whether for disease-specific treatment, palliative care, refusal of life-sustaining treatment or the right to request medication the patient can decide to take to shorten a prolonged and difficult dying process. Only the dying person can know whether their pain and suffering is too great to withstand. The option of medical aid in dying puts the decision-making power where it belongs: with the dying person.

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



*This reflects data from all jurisdictions that report on hospice utilization. Currently, public health departments in nine authorized jurisdictions have issued reports regarding the utilization of medical aid-in-dying laws: Oregon,¹¹ Washington,²⁹ Vermont,³⁰ California,³¹ Colorado,³² Hawai'i,²⁸ the District of Columbia,³³ Maine,¹¹³ and New Jersey.¹¹⁴ More detailed reports can be provided upon request. Vermont, Washington, D.C., New Jersey, and Maine do not provide data on hospice utilization in their reports on medical aid in dying. Further, the data includes a separate category for Colorado, as they report those who are not under hospice care and those whose hospice utilization is unknown as one, aggregated category.

Patients Involve Their Family in the Decision

The vast majority of eligible patients involve their family in their decision-making process and most have someone (family, and sometimes a trusted healthcare provider) present at some point during their planned death, according to the Oregon data:¹¹

- > Ninety-five percent of people who use medical aid in dying informed their families of the decision;
- > Additionally, the state has been collecting and publicly reporting data on the presence of healthcare providers at both the time of ingestion of the medication and the time of death since 2001. In that time, nearly 40% of people reportedly chose to have a provider present at some point during their planned death.

The Oregon Model Has Too Many — Not Too Few — Regulatory Requirements

The current Oregon model, which laid the foundation for all of the other authorized jurisdictions, requires a lengthy, multi-step process. While on paper it appears that a person can get through the process relatively quickly, in reality it takes a dying person several weeks to several months to get through all the steps, if they are able to complete it and obtain the prescription at all.

Unfortunately, many individuals die with needless suffering while attempting to navigate an unnecessarily burdensome process. Some of the biggest challenges include:

- > Many terminally ill patients do not receive their six-month prognosis until they have far less than six months to live. “Physicians are typically optimistic in their estimates of patient survival.”¹⁷ In fact, one study showed that physicians tend to overestimate how long someone is going to live by five times.¹⁸ As another example, despite the fact that six months is a timeframe that is often used as a guide to treatment decisions, including referral to hospice, the average length of hospice care is only 76 days.¹⁹
- > Most of the laws in authorized jurisdictions explicitly allow healthcare systems and doctors to “opt out” of providing this care. All Catholic institutions, the vast majority of other religiously affiliated institutions and even some secular health systems have chosen to do so.²⁰ 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 doctor works at an institution that opts out will have to reestablish care in a supportive health system and find two supportive doctors before they can begin the process of qualifying for medical aid in dying.
- > In addition, quite a bit of heartbreaking 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 in the process 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. Some doctors who personally object to the practice are even refusing to turn over a patient's medical records to a new provider, as is the case with a lawsuit in New Jersey. Patients — not doctors — own their healthcare information.
- > The empirical and anecdotal data from Oregon and the other authorized jurisdictions suggests that this process, as currently constructed, is unnecessarily cumbersome — there are too many regulatory roadblocks for many dying patients to access the law.
 - For example, a study by Kaiser Permanente Southern California²¹ 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 patient preferences, with dedicated patient navigators to assist individuals through the process. The

percentage of patients who die suffering because they start the process in a health system that forbids their doctors from participating is without question considerably higher.

- As mentioned previously, in the years since passage of the Oregon Death With Dignity Act, Disability Rights Oregon has received very few complaints from disabled Oregonians about the Act. The executive director confirmed in 2018, “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.”⁵
- > At a National Academy of Sciences two-day assisted-death conference in 2018, many of the 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.²² As an example:
 - “There are certainly challenges with access where about half of the patients that we heard from were able to follow the process through within their own health system” “The process takes time and that very few patients or health systems report that they are able to complete the request process in 15 days” Helene Starks, associate professor of bioethics and humanities, University of Washington.
 - “All six statutes in the United States require that you be certified, all the eligibility requirements be certified, both by the attending and by a consulting physician. And that attending and consulting physician must be an MD or DO licensed in that state. But many have written that there are big and serious access problems with finding an available and willing physician. So there has been increasing literature on whether or not we should expand medical aid in dying, the clinicians to also include nurse practitioners.” Thaddeus Pope, director, Health Law Institute; and professor of law, Mitchell Hamline School of Law, Minnesota.
 - “Because there's no legal duty to participate, physicians in the state of Oregon and all the other jurisdictions, there's also — in Oregon — no legal duty to refer as well. That's become sort of an obstacle, if you will, for some patients to have access.” Courtney Campbell, Hundere professor in religion and culture, Oregon State University School of History, Philosophy and Religion.
 - “So I'll just say in urban areas, access is limited. In Portland, the three faith-based health systems ... and the VA, which comprise probably the majority of healthcare in the city, and many smaller physician groups adopted policies that forbade physicians to prescribe. Intentionally or not, this also inhibited open discussion at those places. It forced patients into the position of either abandoning their request or seeking care from one of the two health systems

that hadn't forbidden prescription." Erik Fromme, previously from Oregon, now director of Serious Illness Care Program at Ariadne Labs at the Dana Farber Cancer Center in Massachusetts.

- “[D]ata showing lower utilization of aid in dying among low socioeconomic groups might reflect on equal access, rather than a weaker preference for aid in dying among these groups ... I can add just briefly, there's been one pharmacy in Vermont. It's been different at different times, but basically one providing all the prescriptions. And that is part of the access barriers for patients. Some of them, because people are driving long distances to get to that pharmacy, there is a mail-order option, but it seems like it's not been offered to all patients. And then sometimes there's a wait involved with waiting for the medication to come in the mail, and there have been patients that have died while they're waiting for the medication to come.” Mara Buchbinder, associate professor of social medicine, UNC Chapel Hill School of Medicine.
 - “There's quite a bit of information about the lack of access in rural areas of Oregon if the patient was already enrolled in hospice and they wanted to control their death.” Linda Ganzini, professor of psychiatry and medicine, Oregon Health & Science University.
- In Washington, D.C., where the Department of Health added additional regulations to those required by law, creating additional roadblocks for providers willing to participate in this medical practice and terminally ill individuals seeking this compassionate end-of-life care option, it took the first person a full year to access medical aid in dying.^{23,24} Peace of mind was finally granted after advocates and the Legislature put pressure on the Department of Health to drop these additional unnecessary regulations. Although it is still an overly cumbersome process, a few patients have been able to access the law.

In response to the evidence compiled over more than 20 years of practice, the Oregon Legislature passed an important amendment to the law in an attempt to find a better balance between safeguards intended to protect patients and access to medical aid in dying in 2019. As long as a written request is provided and the attending physician attests that the otherwise qualified individual is likely to die while waiting, the amendment gives doctors the ability to waive (1) the 15-day waiting period between the two required oral requests; and, (2) the 48-hour waiting period if they determine and attest that the patient is likely to die while waiting.²⁵ 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.

Just one year into implementation of the Hawai'i Our Care, Our Choice Act, the Department of Health conducted an analysis of the implementation of the law, including soliciting input from the medical community. The report to the Legislature found that some of the well-intentioned regulatory requirements outlined in the Our Care, Our Choice Act are creating unintended barriers for terminally ill patients in Hawaii. The report detailed that at least a half-dozen Hawai'i

residents died in 2019 while waiting to complete the regulatory requirements. In fact, due to lags in the system, the 27 patients who died under the law in 2019 endured an average waiting period of 34 days; one patient waited 100 days.^{26, 27}

As part of the annual report, the department of health 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 advanced practice registered nurses (APRNs) the authority to serve as attending providers under the law.²⁸ The lawmakers in Hawai'i subsequently introduced a bill based on the Department of Health's recommendations.

Some of the states considering legislation are also considering more streamlined approaches to reduce the burden on providers and terminally ill patients like reducing or eliminating the waiting period entirely (New York and Minnesota legislation), allowing nurse practitioners and physician assistants to participate (New Mexico, Florida, Utah, Virginia and Iowa legislation), and prohibiting facilities that opt out of the practice from implementing gag orders on their providers designed to silence discussion about the option (Delaware legislation).

Section IV: State Reports on Utilization

Currently, public health departments in nine authorized jurisdictions have issued reports regarding the utilization of medical aid-in-dying laws: Oregon,¹¹ Washington,²⁹ Vermont,³⁰ California,³¹ Colorado,³² Hawai'i,²⁸ the District of Columbia,³³ Maine,¹¹³ and New Jersey.¹¹⁴ More detailed reports can be provided upon request.

- > Cumulatively, for the past 40+ years, across all jurisdictions only 4,209 people have taken a prescription to end their suffering.¹ This represents far less than 1% of the people who die in each state.
- > One-third of people who go through the process and obtain the prescription never take it; however, they derived peace of mind from simply knowing that if their suffering became too great, they would have the option.
- > The vast majority of terminally ill people who use medical aid in dying — more than 85% — received hospice services at the time of their deaths.
- > There is nearly equal utilization of medical aid in dying among men and women.
- > 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.
- > Ninety percent 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.

All Authorized Jurisdictions	Cumulative
Data Period	1998 – 12/26/2019
Summary Data	
Individuals who received prescriptions (prescriptions written or filled)	6,669
Individuals who died after ingesting	4,209

¹ It is important to note that the Colorado statistics reflect all deaths identified among individuals prescribed aid-in-dying medication, whether or not they used this medication, and irrespective of whether their death was caused by ingestion of medication, the underlying terminal illness or condition, or some other cause. As a result, Colorado's death statistics are not included in the 4,209 total deaths from medical aid in dying.

Characteristics		
Sex		
Female	2,318	48.2%
Male	2,485	51.7%
Unknown	8	0.2%
Total	4,811	100%
Race		
White	4,500	94.3%
Black	12	0.3%
Asian	99	2.1%
Indigenous American/Alaskan Native	3	0.1%
Hawaiin/Pacific Islander	3	0.1%
Other / Unknown	64	1.3%
Multi-Race (Two or more races)	11	0.2%
Latinx (Hispanic)	81	1.7%
Hispanic and/or Non-White (WA) ²	32	2.1%
Total	4,773	100.0%
Age Breakdown (Oregon, Washington, Colorado, D.C.)		
18 – 54	299	8.4%

² Between the years of 2009-2013, the state of Washington reported its data on race as either "non-Hispanic white" or "Hispanic and/or non-white." From the years of 2013-2018, the state reported "white," "other," and "unknown." As such, the Washington data on race is limited in scope.

55 – 64	670	18.7%
65 – 74	1,115	31.2%
75 – 84	905	25.3%
85+	588	16.4%
Total	3,577	100.0%

Age Breakdown (California)		
Under 60	134	10.9%
60 – 69	271	22.1%
70 – 79	353	28.8%
80 – 89	306	24.9%
90+	163	13.3%
Total	1,227	100.0%
Age Breakdown (Maine)		
Under 65	0	0%
Over 65	1	100%
Total	1	100.0%
Education		
High School Diploma or GED or Less	1,219	25.5%
Some College	1,018	21.3%
Associate's Degree, Bachelor's Degree, Master's Degree, Doctorate or Professional Degree	2,499	52.2%
Unknown	51	1.1%

Total	4,787	100.0%
Hospice Care		
Enrolled	3,879	85.9%
Not Enrolled	433	9.6%
Unknown	149	3.3%
Not under hospice care OR unknown (Colorado)	54	1.2%
Total	4,515	100.0%
Insurance		
Private	1,174	27%
Medicare, Medicaid or Other Governmental	2,092	48%
Medicare with Another Type of Insurance (Unspecified)	266	6.1%
Combination of Private and Medicare / Medicaid	260	6.0%
None, Other, Unknown	563	12.9%
Total	4,355	100.0%
Underlying Illness		
Malignant Neoplasms (Cancer)	3,537	72.3%
Neurological Disease	570	11.6%
Respiratory Disease (e.g., COPD)	283	5.8%
Heart / Circulatory Disease / Cardiovascular	289	5.9%
Other illnesses	215	4.4%
Total	4,894	100.0%
Place of Death / Location Where Medication Ingested / Location of Patient		
Home / Private Home / Residence	3,546	89.7%
Assisted-Living Residence / Nursing Home / Long-term Care / Foster Care Facility	280	7.1%
In-Patient Hospice Residence	26	0.7%

Hospital / Other / Unknown	102	2.6%
Total	3,954	100%
Physician or Trained Healthcare Provider Present at Ingestion		
Prescribing Physician	337	9.5%
Attending Physician	243	6.9%
Other Physician	22	0.6%
Other Provider / Healthcare Provider	1,199	33.9%
Volunteer	56	1.6%
No Provider	496	14.0%
Unknown	1,189	33.6%
Total	3,542	100.0%

Section V: The Truth About Medical Aid in Dying

When crafting medical aid-in-dying legislation, lawmakers no longer need to worry about hypothetical scenarios or anecdotal concerns. We now have more than 20 years of data and experience since the Oregon law was enacted and an additional 40+ years of combined experience from the other authorized states. 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 compassionate 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. In order to use medical aid in dying, the terminally ill person must be mentally capable and be able to self-ingest the medication themselves, and therefore, always maintains decision-making authority to change their mind. In contrast, euthanasia is an intentional act by someone (a third party) choosing and acting to cause the death of another. Euthanasia is commonly given as a lethal injection to an individual who has not expressly given consent or may even lack the ability to do so. In some countries, the practice can be used to bring about the death of one who does not have a

terminal diagnosis. Euthanasia is illegal throughout the United States and is expressly prohibited in all medical aid-in-dying laws. Because our guiding value is patient autonomy, 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 Not Suicide

There is a fundamental difference between the practice of medical aid in dying and the act of prematurely ending one's life, often by violent means, that is traumatic for the person's family and community. The latter is often the tragic result of an unrecognized or untreated reversible mental health disorder, such as depression or addiction.

Factually, legally and medically speaking, it is inaccurate to equate medical aid in dying with suicide or assisted suicide. The medical aid-in-dying laws in Oregon, Washington, Vermont, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawai'i, New Jersey and Maine explicitly state, *"Actions taken in accordance with [the Act] shall not, for any purpose, constitute suicide, assisted suicide, mercy killing or homicide, under the law."*

Medical aid-in-dying laws make this distinction because a person who is opting for medical aid in dying already has a terminal diagnosis and a prognosis of six months or less to live. They are not choosing to die; the disease is taking their life. The terminally ill person who chooses medical aid in dying is simply deciding not to prolong a difficult and painful dying process. Those considering prematurely ending their life by committing suicide see no hope, often do not seek assistance and do not recognize that their problems are treatable.³⁴ According to the American Psychological Association, medical aid in dying and suicide have "profound psychological differences."³⁵

Assisting someone to end their life prematurely remains a felony in jurisdictions where medical aid in dying is authorized.

Opponents of medical aid in dying use the term "assisted suicide" in a cynical 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."³⁶ Furthermore, the American Association of Suicidology, a nationally recognized organization that promotes prevention of suicide through research, public awareness programs, education and training comprised of respected researchers and mental health professionals, asserts medical aid in dying is fundamentally distinct from suicide and that the term "physician-assisted suicide" should not be used.³⁷

“ I’m hoping to change the narrative when it comes to medical aid in dying. I want to remove the word ‘suicide’ from the conversation. I am NOT suicidal. I want to live. (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

Factually, legally and medically speaking, it is inaccurate to equate medical aid in dying with assisted suicide. The Oregon, Washington, Vermont, California, Colorado, Hawaii, New Jersey, Maine and District of Columbia laws emphasize that: “Actions taken in accordance with [the Act] shall not, for any purpose, constitute suicide, assisted suicide, mercy killing or homicide, under the law.” This is because a person who is choosing medical aid in dying already has a terminal prognosis of six months or less to live. They are not choosing to die; the disease is taking their life. The terminally ill person who chooses medical aid in dying is simply choosing not to prolong a difficult and painful dying process. Assisting a suicide remains a felony in states where medical aid in dying is authorized. Saying “assisted suicide” uses the language of a crime to describe a medical practice.

Further, there is absolutely no evidence that medical aid in dying impacts suicide rates. Over the past 30 years, Oregon ranked between 7th and 14th in annual rankings of the number of suicides in all states. Oregon’s suicide rate is higher than the national average; however, it is important to consider other factors to get a full picture of the information. First, suicide rates have risen across the country, and most Western states struggle with suicide rates higher than the national average. Wyoming, Nevada, New Mexico, Idaho and Alaska have suicide rates similar to Oregon and do not currently have medical aid-in-dying laws. Second, studies show that access to guns is one reason. Western states have more lax gun laws than other parts of the country. New York, with its more restrictive gun laws, ranks 50th in suicides in the country. A little more than half of all Oregonians who commit suicide use guns (54%), according to the Oregon Public Health Division.¹¹⁵ Guns are used in suicides more than twice as often as

the next two most popular methods: poison (20 percent) and hanging/suffocation (18 percent). Geography is another reason Oregon's suicide rate is high. Suicide risk is higher in rural areas and research shows 90 percent of suicides in rural America involve firearms."^{115, 116, 117} Access to mental healthcare services and treatment in many rural areas is also grievously lacking.

Insurance Companies Do Not Deny Treatment Because Medical Aid in Dying Is an Available End-of-Life Option

There is no connection between the denial of expensive or experimental treatments and the coverage of medical aid in dying as an end-of-life care option. Insurance providers cover treatments that are deemed effective and proven, and they deny coverage for those considered unnecessary, experimental or below the standard of care. Sometimes insurance companies wrongly deny coverage for life-saving treatment. This fact is a harsh reality in every state, those that authorize medical aid in dying and those that do not.

Health insurers have no incentive to encourage medical aid in dying because the vast majority of people who choose medical aid in dying are enrolled in hospice care and no longer pursuing extensive or intensive treatment. Hospice enjoys nearly universal insurance coverage, and hospices have charitable funds to cover those who cannot pay. Medicare covers hospice services — as does Medicaid — with no lag or delay in payment, as with some other services.

Furthermore, people are only choosing medical aid in dying to shorten the very worst, very last part of the dying process. It is shortening a person's life by weeks and days, not months. 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.⁴⁵ The article was co authored by an opponent of medical aid in dying 21 years ago, when use of relatively inexpensive hospice care was less frequent.

Furthermore, each of the laws in the authorized jurisdictions explicitly state that the obligations created by wills, contracts, insurance and annuity policies cannot be affected by a terminally ill individual's decision to request or use medical aid in dying. In other words, an individual is entitled to their existing benefits regardless of whether they use medical aid in dying.

A recent 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."³⁹ 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.

Providers Do Not Have an Incentive to Coerce Patients

Healthcare providers have no incentive to pressure or coerce their patients into requesting or using medical aid in dying. Often, providers will continue to offer treatment, even when the likelihood of a change in the individual's disease is extremely unlikely. Medical providers do not make more money from prescribing medical aid in dying for their eligible patients.

Family Members Do Not Have an Incentive to Coerce Terminally Ill Loved Ones

The terminally ill individual who qualifies for medical aid in dying only has six months or less to live. It strains credulity to believe that a greedy relative would risk criminal prosecution and felony charges (i.e., losing everything rather than inheriting anything) when the person is already expected to die soon. Further, there have been no reports of such an occurrence in the over 20 years that Oregon's law has been in effect. The reality is, if someone who stood to inherit anything of value from a terminally ill individual wanted to hasten death, there are many ways to do so that involve far fewer safeguards and less legal liability: overmedicating, undermedicating, failing to bring the terminally ill person to medical appointments, neglecting the person's needs. Access to this option does not heighten the risk of abuse; it dissuades it.

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.⁴¹ In 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.⁴² Another study published in the *Journal of Medical Ethics* revealed that many caregivers note that their main focus is to keep the patient alive, and that regardless of severe treatment side effects, any treatment is better than none at all.⁴³

Patients Have Various Options for Taking the Medication

The type and dosage of aid-in-dying medication the doctor prescribes for the terminally ill person can vary with each individual. Just like there is not just one blood pressure medicine, there is not just one medication for medical aid in dying. Historically, prescriptions for medical 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 costs and availability of drugs over time, several medications and combinations of medications have been developed and are now successfully used in medical aid-in-dying prescriptions. Today the most commonly prescribed is a compounded mixture of digoxin, diazepam, morphine sulfate, and amitriptyline.

In practice, the doctor, pharmacist and patient determine whether the medication should be prescribed as a powder or as a pre-prepared solution. If dispensed in powder form, the

medication is mixed together with approximately 4 ounces of liquid and ingested by the terminally ill individual.

Once the prescription has been filled, the terminally ill person can choose to take the medication. The individual usually falls asleep within 10 minutes. Respiration slows over the course of an hour or two, then stops, and the individual dies peacefully in their sleep. Parenteral injection and intravenous (IV) administration of aid-in-dying medication by any person, including the doctor, family member or patient themselves, is explicitly prohibited in each of the laws.

Accidental Overdose by a Third Party Has Never Happened and Is Highly Unlikely

There is little to no chance of an accidental overdose attributable to aid-in-dying medication for several reasons: the medication protocol requires three drugs taken at separate and precise times, the last medication must be mixed together, and the medication is bitter to the point of near-intolerance (particularly without the preparatory medication). Not surprisingly, in more than 20 years of experience since the Oregon law was implemented, there has never been a reported case of an accidental overdose from ingesting medical aid-in-dying medication.

Medical Aid-in-Dying Medication Is Safely Disposed of

In decades of combined experience since Oregon became the first of 10 jurisdictions to authorize medical aid in dying, there has never been a single incident of abuse, diversion or misuse of aid-in-dying medications.

Medical aid-in-dying medications are subject to the same disposal procedures as all other controlled substances, including lethal drugs. In instances when medical aid-in-dying medication is dispensed but remains unused when the person dies, hospice can dispose of it just as they do with all unused sedatives and pain medications, many of which are also controlled substances that are potent and hazardous drugs. 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.

In every state, unused medications are disposed of according to the law and disposal process in the state, and this requirement includes aid-in-dying medication. For example, more than 50 jurisdictions have established permanent free collection boxes that are open year-round for safe and anonymous disposal of unused drugs. The federal Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) maintains a website that lists all collection facilities in a community.

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

Death certificates for medical aid in dying are filled out to be compliant 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's critical that the disease that caused the death is listed 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 who are 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 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 authorizing medical aid in dying, dropping their opposition to it, adopting supportive policies and passing laws to authorize the practice. During the 2019 and 2020 legislative sessions, more than 399 individual elected officials put their names on bills as sponsors or co-sponsors in at least 24 legislatures. Fully 95% of these elected officials were re-elected. These bills were proposed in every region of the country. Six new jurisdictions have authorized medical aid in dying in the last five 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 polling from a variety of sources, both nationally and at the state level, demonstrates that the American public consistently supports medical aid in dying, with majority support among nearly every demographic group. A 2015 Gallup poll also noted that support had "risen nearly 20 points in the last two years" and "stands at the highest level in more than a decade."⁴⁴ The importance of this issue was affirmed on November 8, 2016, when the Colorado End of Life Options Act ballot initiative passed in a landslide, earning more votes than any other measure or any other candidate, including presidential candidates, on the ballot.⁴⁵ Support since that time has continued to climb, with 74% of voters supporting medical aid in dying in the most recent, January 2020, Gallup survey.⁴⁶

Majority Support Among Diverse Groups

This broad support spans nearly every demographic, from age to ethnic group, and from religious to political affiliation. In 2016, LifeWay Research, a historically conservative, religious organization, released a survey that concluded national support for medical aid in dying stood at 67%, even though the questionnaire used the biased term "assisted suicide" to describe medical aid in dying.⁴⁷ The survey also demonstrated that majority support spanned a variety of demographic groups, including white Americans (71%), Hispanic Americans (69%), more than half of black, non-Hispanic Americans (53%); adults aged 18 to 24 (77%), 35 to 44 (63%) and 55 to 64 (64%); with some college education (71%), with graduate degrees (73%) and with high school diploma or less (61%). Majority support also included most religious denominations, including Christians (59%), Catholics (70%), Protestants (53%), those of other religions (70%) and those who identified as nonreligious (84%).

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

- > The Dolores Huerta Foundation^{48,49}
- > Hispanic Health Network⁵⁰
- > Latino Commission on AIDS⁵¹

- > Latinos for Healthcare Equity⁵¹
- > National Hispanic Council on Aging⁵²
- > Nuestra Salud⁵³

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

Additionally, 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.⁵⁴ Supporters include the late Maryland Congressman Elijah Cummings, the first African American to be named speaker pro tem in the Maryland House of Delegates, and Maryland Congressman Anthony G. Brown, formerly Maryland's lieutenant governor. In addition, Dr. Benjamin F. Chavis, President and CEO of the National Newspaper Publishers Association and Dr. Jeff Gardere, 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.⁵⁵ "[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."

“ 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

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. Today, 55% of physicians surveyed endorse the idea of medical aid in dying, agreeing that “Physician assisted death should be allowed for terminally ill patients.”

Over the past six years, 30 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 palliative care option among physicians and the public.

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

- > American College of Legal Medicine⁵⁷
- > American Medical Student Association⁵⁸
- > American Medical Women's Association⁵⁹
- > American Public Health Association⁶⁰
- > GLMA: Healthcare Professionals Advancing LGBT Equality⁶¹
- > National Student Nurses' Association⁶²

Six national medical organizations have adopted neutral positions:

- > American Academy of Family Physicians⁶³
- > American Academy of Neurology⁶⁴
- > American Academy of Hospice and Palliative Medicine⁶⁵
- > American Nurses Association⁶⁶
- > American Society for Health System Pharmacists⁶⁷
- > National Association of Social Workers⁶⁸

Medical associations in many of the authorized jurisdictions currently have neutral positions on medical aid in dying, including Oregon,⁶⁹ California,⁷⁰ Colorado,⁷¹ Vermont,⁷² Hawai'i,⁷³ and Maine.⁷⁴ Six other state medical societies and a handful of component societies from nonauthorized states have also recently dropped their opposition.^{75, 76, 77,78,79,80,81,82}

There is growing recognition within the medical profession that patients want, need and deserve this compassionate option at the end of life; and this growing recognition is burgeoning into collaboration. As more jurisdictions authorize medical aid in dying, the medical community is coming together, and providers are sharing their experiences and fine-tuning their collaborative efforts to better serve dying patients.

Support From Other Organizations

In addition to the national medical and Latino organizations that have endorsed medical aid in dying noted above, the Coalition for Liberty and Justice, the Libertarian Party, the Older Women's League, and SAGE, a national organization that provides services and advocacy for LGBT elders, have all endorsed medical aid in dying on a national level.

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 decided to continue considering and developing their position on the matter for the time being. This support varies significantly by state and grows weekly but includes:

- > Bar Associations – California,⁸³ Connecticut⁸⁴
- > American Civil Liberties Union – California,⁸⁵ Connecticut,⁸⁶ D.C.,⁸⁷ Maine,⁸⁸ Massachusetts,⁸⁹ Maryland,⁹⁰ New Jersey,⁹¹ New York⁹²
- > American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees – California⁹³
- > The Arc – New York⁹⁴
- > Disability Rights Oregon,⁵ New Mexico,⁹⁵ Utah⁹⁶
- > Equality California⁹⁷
- > Gay and Lesbian Activist Alliance – D.C.⁹⁸
- > League of Women Voters – Maryland,⁹⁹ New York,¹⁰⁰ Utah¹⁰¹
- > National Association of Social Workers – California,¹⁰² Connecticut,¹⁰³ Massachusetts,¹⁰⁴ New Jersey,¹⁰⁵ New Mexico¹⁰⁶
- > United Church of Christ – Central Atlantic Conference (D.C., Delaware, New Jersey, Maryland)¹⁰⁷
- > United Methodist Church – California-Pacific¹⁰⁸
- > Unitarian Universalist Church – Maryland¹⁰⁹

Impact of Public Political Support

As noted above, public opinion data demonstrates wide public support for medical aid in dying, and voters are rewarding lawmakers who advance this compassionate end-of-life care option by reelecting them. In fact, the vast majority of primary bill sponsors in 2019 and 2020 who introduced medical aid in dying legislation won re-election — incumbent bill sponsors had a 95% reelection rate in the primary and a 95% reelection rate in the general election.

Section VII: About Compassion & Choices

Compassion & Choices is the oldest and largest national organization committed to improving care and expanding options at the end of life. We have hundreds of thousands of supporters across the country. Last fiscal year, our annual budget was nearly \$20 million dollars, which was spent to improve end-of-life care and choice across the country. Our funding comes almost exclusively from the generosity of individuals and family foundations.¹¹⁰ Last fiscal year, more than 35,000 individual donors contributed to our work, with more than 22,000 contributing less than \$100. 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 individuals experiencing unnecessary suffering at life's end, demanding care and seeking policies that better reflect their values and priorities.

Section VIII: Conclusion

Decisions about death belong to the dying, and good public policy enables them to engage in open conversations with their doctors, their loved ones, and their faith or spiritual leaders about their physical and spiritual needs at the end of life. Without the explicitly authorized option of medical aid in dying, people nearing the end of life are unable to access medical aid in dying without putting their providers and family members at risk of prosecution.

With more than 20 years of experience since the first law was enacted and an additional 40+ years of combined experience from the laws passed since demonstrate that medical aid-in-dying laws protect patients, provides an option for the many constituents who believe that each person should have the ability to decide for themselves how much suffering they endure. Allowing this legislation to become law will bring peace of mind to residents at or near the end of their lives. Furthermore, the cost of inaction is high.

Terminally ill individuals:

- > May not try that one last miracle treatment out of fear the treatment will be too painful
- > May choose violent means to end their suffering, rather than this compassionate option
- > Are being deprived of the peace of mind that comes with knowing they can end their suffering if it becomes too great
- > Will experience needless agony when they die ... while families and doctors 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 doctors and patients
- > Better palliative care training
- > Better hospice usage

Your state can realize these benefits for terminally ill individuals and their families right now by joining the growing number of jurisdictions that authorize this compassionate option.

The debate quite simply comes down to who decides and who is in a better position to ensure that compassion guides the care a patient receives at the end of life: the terminally ill patient in consultation with their doctor 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.

References

1. *Clinical Criteria for Physician Aid in Dying*. Journal of Palliative Medicine; D. Orentlicher, T.M. Pope, B.A. Rich, (2015). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Uno90VKE2JcUVC-Wp5lbZ7hYiXdUbJmC/view?usp=sharing>
2. *Nonabandonment: A Central Obligation for Physicians*. Annals of Internal Medicine; T.E. Quill, C.K. Cassel, (1995). Available from: <https://annals.org/aim/article-abstract/708462/nonabandonment-central-obligation-physicians>
3. *A History of the Law of Assisted Dying in the United States*. SMU Law Review, A. Meisel, (2019). Available from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1EdA_NskEnxzOgm0hMjBk3L1hoUvQdsU/view?usp=sharing
4. *Legal Physician-Assisted Dying in Oregon and the Netherlands: Evidence Concerning the Impact on Patients in "Vulnerable" Groups*. Journal of Medical Ethics, M.P. Battin, A. Van der Heide, L. Ganzini, G. Van der Wal, B.D. Onwuteaka-Philipsen, (2007). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DYkyHm849qDWMN-fz2O4WukbZeQoQwVD/view?usp=sharing>
5. *Letter from Disability Rights Oregon*. Executive Director, Bob Joondeph, (2019). Available from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1egebucDqLpYXzui3YvUA78_0Tdz-jYh/view?usp=sharing
6. *A Therapeutic Death: A Look at Oregon's Law*. Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, K. Cerminara & A. Perez, (2000.) Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12661538>
7. *Lessons from Oregon in Embracing Complexity in End-of-Life Care*. New England Journal of Medicine, S.W. Tolle, MD, J.M. Teno, MD, (2017). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1MphT-R3y318wx07f4J7UbTqRRsy4GkOS/view?usp=sharing>
8. *Oregon Physicians' Attitudes About and Experiences With End-of-Life Care Since Passage of the Oregon Death with Dignity Act*. JAMA. L. Ganzini, H.D. Nelson, M.A. Lee, D.F. Kraemer, T.A. Schmidt, M.A. Delorit, (2001). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/14A5j8thvleBlNhHuNDn95lwlNcmZtZT/view?usp=sharing>
9. *Geographic Variation of Hospice Use Patterns at the End of Life*. Journal of Palliative Medicine, S.Y. Wang, M.D, Aldridge, C.P. Gross, et al.. (2015). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QFAKH9q63iL5O-39l-Cr7WtYQcTUOgWE/view?usp=sharing>
10. *Oregon's Assisted Suicide Vote: The Silver Lining*. Annals of Internal Medicine, M.A. Lee, S.W. Tolle, (1996). Available from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1x2_gO8zXAhFFDzw921iRARg8HH3H5h8f/view?usp=sharing
11. *Oregon Death with Dignity Act Annual Report*, (2019). Available from: <https://oregon.gov/oha/PH/PROVIDERPARTNERRESOURCES/EVALUATIONRESEARCH/DEATHWITHDIGNITYACT/Documents/year22.pdf>
12. *There's an Unforeseen Benefit to California's Physician-Assisted Death Law*. Los Angeles Times, (2017). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1eHytFoJ00jsxAWxXlgaNiwXYu8X2H44q/view?usp=sharing>
13. *The Use of Opioids and Sedatives at the End of Life*. The Lancet Oncology, N. Sykes, A. Thorns, (2003). Available from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1--evjxiTi04l3UWGGOPY_Y7ujdFm5pxxl/view?usp=sharing
14. *The Epidemiology of Pain During the Last 2 Years of Life*. The Annals of Internal Medicine, A.K. Smith, I.S. Cenzer, S.J. Knight, K.A. Puntillo, E. Widera, B.A. Williams, W.J. Boscardin, K.E. Covinsky, (2010.) Available from: <http://annals.org/aim/article/746344/epidemiology-pain-during-last-2-years-life>

15. *Breakthrough Pain in Patients with Cancer: Essential Concepts for Nursing, Pharmacy, Oncology, and Pain Management*. Medscape, J. Ashley, RN, MSN, J.T. D'Olimpio, MD, (2009). Available from: <http://www.medscape.org/viewarticle/712261>
16. *Minority Cancer Patients and Their Providers: Pain Management Attitudes and Practice*. Cancer. K.O. Anderson, T.R. Mendoza, V. Valero, S.P. Richman, C. Russell, J. Hurley, C. DeLeon, P. Washington, G. Palos, R. Payne, C.S. Cleeland (2000). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/10X8QG0JBDSI5AKHJxw17uujroBIBS9b/view?usp=sharing>
17. *Tough Question to Answer, Tough Answer to Hear*. New York Times (2007). Available from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RnayeYfP66wGhn_d0MTJmGprZpw41wEV/view?usp=sharing
18. *Extent and Determinants of Error in Doctors' Prognoses in Terminally Ill Patients: Prospective Cohort Study*. The British Medical Journal, N.A. Christakis, E.B. Lamont, (2000). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1pldXlr7YSdflo-FRltgpHsO3kAK6Cwak/view?usp=sharing>
19. *Facts and Figures: Hospice Care in America*. National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization, (2018). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ST3sCLGcKyHHNqpixYOLiWt20ad0sel4/view?usp=sharing>
20. *Wave Of Mergers That Have Widened Reach Of Catholic Hospitals Brings Religious-Based Restrictions On Care*. Kaiser Health News (2018). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-s2IFXkkKK4RNGiKOX03BmYiEOC4q6kd/view?usp=sharing>
21. *Characterizing Kaiser Permanente Southern California's Experience With the California End of Life Option Act in the First Year of Implementation*. JAMA Internal Medicine, H.Q. Nguyen, E.J. Gelman, T.A. Bush, J.S. Lee, M.H. Kanter (2018). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1dbqeQBz10AR2kycW56DwcwjfVq9yg2bW/view?usp=sharing>
22. *Physician-Assisted Death: Scanning the Landscape: Proceedings of a Workshop*. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine; Health and Medicine Division; Board on Health Sciences Policy, R.A. English, C.T. Liverman, C.M. Cilio, J. Alper, Rapporteurs (2018). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1JgOqLZWpD9pVlhEbqTimfbGB26uLrRyD/view?usp=sharing>
23. *DC Patients Unable to Use Aid-in-Dying Law as Paperwork Jams*. WUSA9 (2018). Available from: <https://www.wusa9.com/article/news/local/dc-patients-unable-to-use-aid-in-dying-law-as-paperwork-jams/65-536026208>
24. *She Fought Cancer and Congress for D.C.'s Right-to-Die Law. Would She be Able to Use it?* Washington Post (2018). Available from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/dc-politics/she-fought-cancer-and-congress-for-dcs-right-to-die-law-would-she-be-able-to-use-it/2018/12/25/bd77476a-cbe0-11e8-a360-85875bac0b1f_story.html?utm_term=.9f9e6a75a020
25. Senate Bill 579, 80th Oregon Legislative Assembly--2019 Regular Session. Available from: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB579/Enrolled>
26. *Hawai'i Our Care, Our Choice Act Annual Report* (2018). Available from: <https://health.hawaii.gov/opppd/files/2019/06/2019-Annual-OCOCA-Report-062819.pdf>
27. *Report: Too Many People Are Dying While Waiting For Medical Aid In Dying*. Civil Beat, (2020). Available from: <https://www.civilbeat.org/2020/01/report-too-many-people-are-dying-while-waiting-for-medical-aid-in-dying/>

28. *Hawai'i Our Care, Our Choice Act Annual Report* (2019). Available from:
<https://health.hawaii.gov/opppd/files/2020/01/OPPPD-Our-Care-Our-Choice-Act-Annual-Report-2019-1.pdf>
29. *Washington Death with Dignity Act Annual Report* (2019). Available from:
<https://doh.wa.gov/Portals/1/Documents/Pubs/422-109-DeathWithDignityAct2018.pdf>
30. *Vermont Patient Choice at the End of Life Data Report*. (2020). Available from:
<https://legislature.vermont.gov/assets/Legislative-Reports/2020-Patient-Choice-Legislative-Report-2.0.pdf>
31. *California End of Life Option Act Annual Report* (2019). Available from:
<https://cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHSI/CDPH%20Document%20Library/CDPH%20End%20of%20Life%20Option%20Act%20Report%202018-FINAL.pdf>
32. *Colorado End of Life Options Act Annual Report* (2019). Available from:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1FmoyCcl2gHopDO9rCJ2lGFEMUye8FQei/view>
33. *District of Columbia Death with Dignity Act Annual Report*. (2019). Available from:
https://dchealth.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/doh/page_content/attachments/DWD%20Report%202018%20Final%20%20%208-2-2019.pdf
34. *Efficacy of Crisis Intervention*. The Journal of Crisis of Intervention and Suicide Prevention, T. Reisch, P. Schlatter, W. Tschacher, W. (1999). Available from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1999-03549-004>
35. *American Psychological Association, Resolution on Assisted Dying*. (2017) Available from:
<http://www.apa.org/about/policy/assisted-dying-resolution.aspx>.
36. *American College of Legal Medicine, Policy on Aid in Dying*. (2008). Available from:
https://aclm.memberclicks.net/assets/docs/Policy_On_Aid_In_Dying.pdf
37. *"Suicide" is Not the Same as "Physician Aid in Dying."* American Association of Suicidology (2017). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1vZZDQhMiYh7zF3kEunAFa3PSt8VuyglS/view?usp=sharing>
38. *National Center for Health Statistics, Suicide Mortality by State*. Available from:
<https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/sosmap/suicide-mortality/suicide.htm>
39. *Poverty: Not a Justification for Banning Physician-Assisted Death*. Hastings Center Report, L.M. Freeman, S.L. Rose, S.J. Youngner (2018). Available from:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/13H7kOq30lygaNUZlhHrpxDmHWZug5hKA/view?usp=sharing>
40. *Cancer Centers Sell Out Science when they Advertise Clinical Trials as Treatment*. STAT, J. Kimmelman, A.J. London, (2018). Available from:
<https://www.statnews.com/2018/04/25/cancer-centers-advertising-clinical-trials/>
41. *Compromised Autonomy: When Families Pressure Patients to Change Their Wishes*. Journal of Hospice and Palliative Nursing, L. Blackler, LCSW-R, MBE, (2016). Available from:
https://www.nursingcenter.com/cearticle?an=00129191-201608000-00003&Journal_ID=260877&Issue_ID=3584510#P30
42. *The Role of the Family in Treatment Decision Making by Patients with Cancer*. Oncology Nursing Forum, A.Y. Zhang, L.A. Siminoff, (2003). Available from:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1JKaFj06uxorc4QWtUdfcPMdPjboL6cM-/view?usp=sharing>
43. *Making Decisions for Hospitalized Older Adults: Ethical Factors Considered by Family Surrogates*. Journal of Clinical Ethics, J. Fritch, S. Petronio, P.R. Helft, A. Torke (2013). Available from:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WnywF3l4OxJXHouFaHkS9lGpy76yLS9e/view?usp=sharing>

44. *In U.S., Support Up for Doctor-Assisted Suicide*. Gallup Poll, (2015). Available from www.gallup.com/poll/183425/support-doctor-assisted-suicide.aspx?utm_source=Politics&utm_medium=newsfeed&utm_campaign=tiles.
45. Emanuel EZ, Battin MP. 1998. *What Are the Potential Cost Savings from Legalizing Physician-Assisted Suicide?* *NEJM* 339:167-172. Available from: <https://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJM199807163390306>
46. *Prevalence of Living Wills in U.S. Up Slightly*, (2020). Available from: <https://news.gallup.com/poll/312209/prevalence-living-wills-slightly.aspx>
47. *American Views on Assisted Suicide*. LifeWay Research (2016). Available from: <http://lifewayresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Sept-2016-American-Views-Assisted-Suicide.pdf>
48. *Civil Rights Icon Dolores Huerta Partners with End-of-Life Care Advocacy Group to Launch Multi-State Bilingual Education Campaign*. Available from: <https://compassionandchoices.org/news/civil-rights-icon-dolores-huerta-partners-with-end-of-life-care-advocacy-group-to-launch-multi-state-bilingual-education-campaign-2/>
49. *Let's Stand for Aid-in-Dying Law*. Albuquerque Journal, D. Huerta, Guest Column OpEd, (2019). Available from: <https://www.abqjournal.com/1270710/lets-stand-for-aidindying-law.html>
50. *Catholic and Latino Perspectives on End-of-Life Suffering; Hispanic Health Network*, El Dario, G. Chacón, Guest Column OpEd (2018). Available from: <https://eldiariiony.com/2018/02/11/perspectiva-catolica-y-latina-sobre-el-sufrimiento-de-fin-de-vida/>
51. *Latinos Support Medical Aid in Dying; Latino Commission on AIDS*. El Dario, Dr. J. Torres, Guest Column OpEd, El Dario, (2019). Available from: <https://eldiariiony.com/2019/01/29/los-latinos-apoyan-la-ayuda-medica-para-morir/>
52. *All Americans Should have Access to All End-of-Life Care Options*. The Hill, Y. Cruz, Guest Column OpEd, (2017). Available from: <https://thehill.com/opinion/healthcare/357575-all-americans-should-have-access-to-all-end-of-life-care-options>
53. *My Father-in-Law Wanted End-of-Life Care Options. We all Should Have Them*. Albuquerque Journal, M. Otera, Guest Column OpEd, (2018). Available from: <https://www.abqjournal.com/1171348/my-fatherinlaw-wanted-endoflife-care-options-we-all-should-have-them.html>
54. *D.C. Becomes Seventh Jurisdiction to Allow Terminally Ill to End Their Lives*. The Washington Post, A.C. Davis and F.Nirappil (2016). Available from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/dc-politics/dc-becomes-seventh-jurisdiction-to-allow-terminally-ill-to-end-their-lives/2016/11/15/da497266-ab5b-11e6-977a-1030f822fc35_story.html?utm_term=.1500305615e9
55. *Statement of Support Regarding End-of-Life Options*, Representative Elijah Cummings, (2019). Available from: <http://compassionandchoices.org/wp-content/uploads/Rep.Cummings-HB399-SB311-2019.pdf>
56. *Medscape Ethics Report 2020: Life, Death, and Pain*, (2020). Available from: <https://www.medscape.com/slideshow/2020-ethics-report-life-death-6013311#2>
57. *American College of Legal Medicine*, Position on Medical Aid in Dying, (2008). Available from: https://aclm.memberclicks.net/assets/docs/Policy_On_Aid_In_Dying.pdf
58. *American Medical Student Association*, Excerpted from: Preambles, Purposes, Principles: Principles Regarding Physician Aid in Dying. (2008). Available from: <http://www.amsa.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/PPP-2015.pdf>

59. *American Medical Women's Association*, Excerpted from: Position Paper on Aid in Dying (2013/2018). Available from: <https://www.amwa-doc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Medical-Aid-in-Dying-Position-Paper.pdf>
60. *American Public Health Association*, Excerpted from: Patient's Rights to Self-Determination at the End. Policy # 20086. (2008). Available from: <https://www.apha.org/policies-and-advocacy/public-health-policy-statements/policy-database/2014/07/29/13/28/patients-rights-to-self-determination-at-the-end-of-life>
61. *GLMA Letter of Support on AB X2-15*, (2015). Available from: <https://compassionandchoices.org/wp-content/uploads/GLMA-Letter-in-Support-of-CA-End-of-Life-Option-Act-2015.pdf>.
62. *National Student Nurses' Association*, NSNA Resolutions (2018). Available from: <https://compassionandchoices.org/wp-content/uploads/National-Student-Nurses-Association-NSNA-Resolutions-2018-Pg.-57.pdf>.
63. *American Academy of Family Physicians COD Addresses Medical Aid in Dying, Institutional Racism*. (2018). Available from: <https://www.aafp.org/news/2018-congress-fmx/20181010cod-hops.html>
64. *American Academy of Neurology position statement on Lawful Physician-Hastened Death*. (2018). Available from: <http://n.neurology.org/content/90/9/420>
65. *American Academy of Hospice & Palliative Medicine*. Excerpted from: Statement on Physician-Assisted Death (2007). Available from: <http://aahpm.org/positions/pad>
66. *American Nurses Association, The Nurse's Role When a Patient Requests Medical Aid in Dying* (2019). Revised Position Statement. Available from: <https://www.nursingworld.org/~49e869/globalassets/practiceandpolicy/nursing-excellence/ana-position-statements/social-causes-and-health-care/the-nurses-role-when-a-patient-requests-medical-aid-in-dying-web-format.pdf>
67. *American Society of Health-System Pharmacists, Board Report on the Joint Council Task Force on Pharmacist Participation in Medical Aid in Dying*, (2016). Available from: <https://www.ashp.org/-/media/assets/house-delegates/docs/hod-board-report-on-task-force.ashx>
68. *National Association of Social Workers, NASW Standards for Palliative and End of Life Care*, Available from: <https://www.socialworkers.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=xBMd58VwFhk%3D&portalid=0>.
69. *Oregon Medical Association Position on Medical Aid in Dying*. Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3luDjCAxxv7cQwYzdWjZEb0xqbFE4eWRHbTMzNVhsck00/view?usp=sharing>
70. *California Medical Association Position on Medical Aid in Dying*. Available from: <https://www.cmadoes.org/newsroom/news/view/ArticleId/27210/California-Medical-Association-removes-opposition-to-physician-aid-in-dying-bill>
71. *Colorado Medical Society, Position on Medical Aid in Dying*. Available from: <https://www.cms.org/articles/prop-106-may-june>
72. *Vermont Medical Society, Position on Medical Aid in Dying*, (2017). Available from: <http://www.vtmd.org/sites/default/files/2017End-of-Life-Care.pdf>
73. *Hawai'i Society of Clinical Oncology Position on Medical Aid in Dying* (2018). Available from: https://www.accc-cancer.org/docs/ossn-network/hi/pdf/advocacy/hSCO-maid-statement-on-letterhead.pdf?sfrsn=d348ccab_0

74. *Maine Medical Association (MMA) Position on Medical Aid in Dying*, (2017). Available from:
<http://newsmanager.commpartners.com/mainemed/issues/2017-05-01/index.html>
75. *New York State Assembly of Family Physicians Position on Medical Aid in Dying*, (2017). Available from:
<http://www.nysafp.org/NYSAFP/media/PDFs/Policy-Positions-Manual-TOC-links-2017.pdf>
76. *New Mexico Medical Society Position on Medical Aid in Dying* (2019). Available from:
https://d2zhgeghghqjuwb.cloudfront.net/accounts/14766/original/2019_1_5_Council_Minutes_-_PENDING_APPROVAL.pdf?1547577653
77. *California Academy of Family Physicians Position on Medical Aid in Dying*, (2015). Available from:
<https://www.familydocs.org/cme/eol/>
78. *Connecticut State Medical Society Position on Medical Aid in Dying*. (2019). Available from:
<https://www.cga.ct.gov/2019/PHdata/Tmy/2019HB-05898-R000318-Connecticut%20State%20Medical%20Society-TMY.PDF>
79. *MEDCHI, The Maryland State Medical Society House of Delegates Position on Medical Aid in Dying*. (2016)
Available from
<http://www.medchi.org/Portals/18/files/Events/Resolution%2016-16.pdf?ver=2016-08-26-140448-047>
80. *Massachusetts Medical Society Position on Medical Aid in Dying* (2017). Available from:
<http://www.massmed.org/News-and-Publications/MMS-News-Releases/Massachusetts-Medical-Society-adopts-several-organizational-policies-at-Interim-Meeting/#.Wno8iOg-c6i>
81. *Minnesota Medical Association Position on Medical Aid in Dying* (2017) Available from:
<http://www.mnmed.org/news-and-publications/News/MMA-Revises-Its-Policy-on-Physician-Aid-In-Dying>
82. *Washington Academy of Family Physicians Position on Medical Aid in Dying* (2018).
83. *The Conference of California Bar Associations, Testimony in Support of ABX2-15* (2015.) Available from:
<https://docs.google.com/a/compassionandchoices.org/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=Y29tcGFzc2lybmfuZGNob2ljZXMuY3JnfGZpZWxkfGd4OjY3MjQ4ZTc1ZGYyNmViODU>
84. *The Connecticut Bar Association, Testimony in Support of HB7015,"* (2015). Available from:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bw3-ddVJDONbYVW2aUM1S2VybmM/view?usp=sharing>
85. *ACLU of California, Statement of Support for Medical Aid in Dying*. (2014). Available from:
<https://docs.google.com/a/compassionandchoices.org/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=Y29tcGFzc2lybmfuZGNob2ljZXMuY3JnfGZpZWxkfGd4OjY3MjQ4ZTc1ZGYyNmViODU>
86. *ACLU of Connecticut, Statement of Support for Medical Aid in Dying*. (2018). Available from:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bw3-ddVJDONbWmZ6X2tXWHJXcnc/view>
87. *ACLU of DC, Statement of Support for Medical Aid in Dying*. (2016). Available from:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B2_hTFIfbvb6ODh1bDBkaVRMeFE/view
88. *ACLU of Maine, Statement of Support for Medical Aid in Dying* (2015). Available from:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bw3-ddVJDONbdXRGm0WmRxTjg/view>
89. *ACLU of Massachusetts, Statement of Support for Medical Aid in Dying* (2015). Available from:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bw3-ddVJDONbUDdJRW05eDg1N0E/view>
90. *ACLU of Maryland, Statement of Support for Medical Aid in Dying* (2019). Available from:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B7F_2qV9lgl-M0ZOUTJhbF9UX0E4dWVvaMlJrdnpzbi1jdmxj/view

107. *United Church of Christ, Statement of Support for Medical Aid in Dying*. Central Atlantic Conference. (2019). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SagtKiGt1CYDDCOZsb6tFZS1MA9ktHlh/view?usp=sharing>
108. *United Methodist Church - California-Pacific. Statement of Support for Medical Aid in Dying* (2015). Available from: <https://docs.google.com/a/compassionandchoices.org/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=Y29tcGFzc2lybmFuZGNob2ljZXMub3JnfGZpZWxkfGd4OjMyYTcyZTO1YTViZmY2N2I>
109. Unitarian Universalist Church, Maryland, *Statement of Support for Medical Aid in Dying* (2019). Available from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1t3xsiEOxFnrTNCHqUCkqjERoI93RCDLZ/view>
110. *Compassion & Choices and Compassion & Choices Action Network Combined Financial Statements, Years Ended June 30, 2019 and 2018 with Independent Auditor's Report*. Available from: <http://compassionandchoices.org/wp-content/uploads/FY19-Fin-Stmt-06.30.19-18.pdf>
111. *Patient Directed Care at End of Life Annual Report* (2020). Available from: <https://www.maine.gov/dhhs/sites/maine.gov.dhhs/files/documents/Death-with-Dignity-Legislative-Report-050420.pdf>.
112. *New Jersey Medical Aid in Dying for the Terminally Ill Act 2019 Data Summary Report* (2019). Available from: https://www.nj.gov/health/advancedirective/documents/maid/2019_MAID_DataSummary.pdf.
113. *Maine Patient Directed Care at End of Life Annual Report* (2020) Available from: <https://maine.gov/dhhs/sites/maine.gov.dhhs/files/documents/Death-with-Dignity-Legislative-Report-050420.pdf>
114. *New Jersey Medical Aid in Dying for the Terminally Ill Act* (2019) Available from: https://nj.gov/health/advancedirective/documents/maid/2019_MAID_DataSummary.pdf
115. *Suicides in Oregon: Trends and Associated Factors 2003-2012*, Oregon Health Authority, Public Health Division, Oregon Violent Death Reporting System. Available from: <http://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/DISEASESCONDITIONS/INJURYFATALITYDATA/Documents/NVDRS/Suicide%20in%20Oregon%202015%20report.pdf>
116. Miller, M., & Hemenway, D. (2008). Guns and suicide in the United States. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 359(10), 989–991.
117. Brent, D. A., & Bridge, J. (2003). Firearms availability and suicide: Evidence, interventions, and future directions. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(9), 1192–1210



Care and Choice at the End of Life

CompassionAndChoices.org // 800.247.7421