

**EUTHANASIA: COMPARISON BETWEEN LAW IN
MALAYSIA AND THE NETHERLANDS**

By

Farah Adlini Binti Hj Mohd Din (2002375706)

Patricia Lawie Petrus Langi (2002376096)

Sharifah Hajijah Binti Wan Ahmad (2002376176)

Sujaihah Binti Abd Ghafar (2002376256)

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Bachelor in
Legal Studies (Hons)

Universiti Teknologi MARA

Faculty of Law

October 2005

The students/authors confirm that the work submitted is their own and
that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to
the work of others

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Assalamualaikum, we would like to express our sincere thanks to Pn. Mimi Sintia for her guidance in completing this Honours Project Paper (HPP). We named our project paper as Euthanasia: Comparison between Law in Malaysia and the Netherlands. A special thanks also to Prof Madya Sue Valquis for being cooperative and helpful to us in giving details and cases regarding to Euthanasia. We would like to express our deepest thanks to the Faculty of Law, Mara University of Technology especially the Dean, Puan Musrifah Sapardi and the staffs.

This research project has been carried out by a team which included Patricia Lawie Petrus Langi, Sharifah Hajijah Bt Wan Ahmad, Sujaihah Bt Abdul Ghafar and I, Farah Adlini Bt Hj Mohd Din. My contributions to the project paper is to distribute the tasks among the members, arranged an appointment and conduct an interview with Prof. Sue Valquis, do the final editing and compiling the project paper and transformed the soft copy of the project paper to hard copy (printing, photocopying, binding, etc) and my major focus is on Chapter two and to finish up half of chapter five which is conclusion, recommendations and legal scholar's opinion. Meanwhile, Patricia's task was to conduct an interview together with me and do Chapter four and half of Chapter five. Sharifah Hajijah involved in Chapter three. Lastly Sujaihah was given a task to handle Chapter one. I would like to compliment my member groups in giving out their best though there were hard times among us. We had several arguments but thanks God because making everything possible for us in producing this project paper. Thanks also to our beloved lecturers and friends for their support and understanding on the workload that we have in this period of research.

We are also grateful to all our family members who are everywhere in Malaysia from Kelantan, Kedah and Sarawak. Thanks for understanding the time constraint that we have in between accomplishing this research work. Our sincere appreciation also extends to my entire fellow undergraduate students and also colleagues in UiTM who have provided assistance at various occasions.

ABSTRACT

This project paper attempts to identify that euthanasia has been slowly accepted in modern society and also to enhance the level of awareness among Malaysian society regarding euthanasia. Moreover, the objective is also to scrutinize the law of euthanasia in Malaysia and to examine the law of euthanasia in The Netherlands and to inquire into the extent to which physician-assisted death for terminally ill patients is likely to be accepted in Malaysia.

The significance of the study is to study the social and moral implication as to euthanasia, the effects to the family and also society as a whole. We also would like to know or identified the religious view and elements in the decision to implement euthanasia in Malaysia and the law established to control and administered euthanasia in socio-medical issue.

Data were gathered from medical journals, case law, conducted an interview, and through articles from the internet. The report concludes that there is no possible way for Malaysia to implement euthanasia into its law. The word euthanasia does not exist in The Penal Code.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-------|
| Acknowledgment | ii |
| Abstract | iii |
| Contents | iv |
| List of Cases | x |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION OF EUTHANASIA | |
| 1.0 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Background | 2 |
| 1.1.1 Types of Euthanasia | 3-7 |
| 1.2 Objectives and Scope | 8-10 |
| 1.3 Significance of the Research | 11 |
| 1.4 Limitation of the Research | 12 |
| CHAPTER TWO: EUTHANASIA IN THE NETHERLANDS | |
| 2.0 Introduction | 13-14 |
| 2.1 Legalization of Euthanasia in the Netherlands | 15-18 |
| 2.1.1 Non Terminally Ill | 19-20 |
| 2.2 Rummelink Report in 1990 | 21-22 |
| 2.3 Conclusion | 23-24 |
| CHAPTER THREE: POSITION OF EUTHANASIA IN MALAYSIA | |
| 3.1 Malaysian Law Regarding Euthanasia | 25-30 |
| 3.2 Conclusion | 33 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: CASE STUDY; TERRY SCHIAVO | |
| 4.1 Personal Biodata | 34-35 |
| 4.2 Why They Choose Euthanasia? | 36-38 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 4.3 | Reasons Behind Judgment | 39 |
| 4.3.1 | Means of Euthanasia, Starvation and Dehydration | 39 |

CHAPTER FIVE: DEALING WITH CHALLENGES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EUTHANASIA IN MALAYSIA

| | | |
|-------|--|-------|
| 5.1 | Euthanasia: According to Culture, Religion & Medical Perspective | 40 |
| 5.1.1 | Culture | 40-41 |
| 5.1.2 | Religion | 41-42 |
| 5.1.3 | Medical | 43 |
| 5.2 | Conclusions and Recommendations | 44-45 |
| 5.3 | Legal Scholar's Opinion | 46-48 |
| | Bibliography | 49-50 |
| | Appendices | 51 |
| | Appendix 1: Interview Questions | 51-52 |