

CAROLYN A. QUATTROCKI
Chief Deputy Attorney General

LEONARD J. HOWIE III
Deputy Attorney General

CARRIE J. WILLIAMS
Deputy Attorney General

ZENITA WICKHAM HURLEY
Chief, Equity, Policy, and Engagement



STATE OF MARYLAND
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

ANTHONY G. BROWN
Attorney General

PETER V. BERNIS
General Counsel

CHRISTIAN E. BARRERA
Chief Operating Officer

IRNISE F. WILLIAMS
Assistant Attorney General

February 27, 2025

TO: The Honorable Joseline A. Pena-Melnyk, Chair
Health and Government Operations Committee

FROM: The Office of the Attorney General

RE: House Bill 1328- End-of-Life Option Act (The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings
and the Honorable Shane E. Pendergrass Act)- **SUPPORT**

The Office of the Attorney General continues to strongly support End-of-Life options legislation. HB1328 has been carefully drafted to allow terminally ill patients considering all their end-of-life options the autonomous right to choose the timing and circumstances of their death while providing safeguards to protect them.

Maryland courts have acknowledged the common law right of a competent adult to refuse medical care under the doctrine of informed consent but have stopped short of allowing a patient to end their life at the time and in the manner that preserves their dignity and prevents undue suffering.¹ This bill – through amendments to the Health General, Insurance, and Criminal Articles - would allow an individual to make an end-of-life decision and self-administer medication to bring about their own death at the time of their choosing. The bill specifically prohibits any person to end the life of another by lethal injection, mercy killing, or euthanasia.

Decisions around the end of life are deeply personal for patients and their families. While the vast majority choose palliative or hospice care, only the person confronting their own mortality can decide if their condition is truly unbearable. This bill provides a thoughtful and deliberate multiple-step approach that ensures these decisions are made in an appropriate context, with due gravity, and with the patient in control of this intensely private decision.

The debate around this issue can be passionate. This bill or a similar version has been before the General Assembly many times before. But experience from other states and around the world demonstrates this option can be implemented in a safe and effective manner, without abuse or

¹ *Stouffer v. Reid*, 413 Md. 491 (2010).

coercion.² This bill in no way permits anyone to end the life of another for any reason; rather, it recognizes that those suffering from end-of-life conditions deserve bodily autonomy and should have the right to choose and direct their own care.

We encourage this Committee to advance the End-of-Life Options Act. For people with end-of-life conditions that are reduced to permanent pain without hope of relief or improvement, the lack of such a law is cruel and unjust.

cc: The Honorable Terri L. Hill, *et. al.*

² End-of-Life Options or “Death with Dignity” legislation has passed in 11 U.S. jurisdictions: California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Montana, Maine, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Vermont, and Washington. It is also a right made available in 10 foreign countries: Switzerland, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Colombia, Canada, Austria, New Zealand, Spain and Australia.