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I. Introduction
   A. Attention Getter: The most affected groups of patients include those suffering from incurable diseases, experiencing unbearable limits of pain, or sustained in irreversible states of comma.
   B. Reason to listen: Like other topics affecting human lives, the decision as to whether euthanasia should be accepted or rejected has historically sparked controversial debates with parts of the society advocating for it while others reject it.
   C. Thesis Statement: While euthanasia should be legalized in specific circumstances, accompanying restrictions should be incorporated in laws to prevent the practice from being misused.

II. Arguments for Euthanasia
   A. By allowing patients access to mercy killing, they are seen to exercise their freedom of choice and end their suffering.
      1. Some terminal illnesses get accompanied with devastating health conditions and excruciating pain that perpetually keeps the patients mourning.
      2. Knowing that such patients may ultimately die, supporters of assisted suicide front the idea that the patients have the choice to die immediately or latter because they are still dying anyway.
   B. Economic relief in situations where there is no cure for the illnesses.

III. Counter-argument
No human has had the ability to create life and as such, none can have the authority to take it away; even if it is their own.

IV. Conclusion

While certain cases may circumstantially deserve assisted suicide, laws must be enacted to protect the practice from misuse.
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Commonly referred to as euthanasia, mercy killing, or assisted suicide, the decision to end suffering patients’ lives may be made in various circumstances. The most affected groups of patients include those suffering from incurable diseases, experiencing unbearable limits of pain, or sustained in irreversible states of comma. Like other topics affecting human lives, the decision as to whether euthanasia should be accepted or rejected has historically sparked controversial debates with parts of the society advocating for it while others reject it. The most common reasons for supporting the act include economic considerations, the desire to save a patient from extreme suffering, ethics of the right to die, and prevention of misuse by legal control. Conversely, religious, cultural, and medical ethics oppose the belief in assisted suicide. Most of them consider it as a pessimistic approach to failed medical alternatives. Further, the contrarians believe that global authorization of the act will open doors to misuse and mass killings of innocent patients (Battin, Rhodes & Silvers, 2015). While euthanasia should be legalized in specific circumstances, accompanying restrictions should be incorporated in laws to prevent the practice from being misused.

Most proponents of euthanasia focus on the plight and rights of the patients involved. Some terminal illnesses get accompanied with devastating health conditions and excruciating pain that perpetually keeps the patients mourning. Knowing that such patients may ultimately die, supporters of assisted suicide front the idea that the patients have the choice to die immediately or latter because they are still dying anyway. By allowing them access to mercy killing, they are seen to exercise their freedom of choice and end their suffering. In cases where the diseases involved are likely to worsen their conditions, such a step is believed to grant them the opportunity of dying with dignity. Another leading reason for euthanasia is economic relief
in situations where there is no cure for the illnesses and the patient will ultimately die even with quality medical care (Orfali, 2011).

Battin, Rhodes, and Silvers (2015) expressed openly that no human has had the ability to create life. Hence, none can have the authority to take it away; even if it is their own. With regard to living in pain and suffering, Orfali (2011) indicated that continued advancements in medicine have led to the development of effective pain management techniques. Some of these involve the termination of nerve and sensory endings that deliver pain transmissions to the brain. Thus, it is not reasonable to use pain as an excuse to effect euthanasia. Additionally, it is not reasonable to end a life in the view of saving finances and equipment. According to Stefan (2016), all the moments of human lives are precious and should be supported to the end.

With both arguments considered closely, it remains true that someone may be sick, have resources consumed in their treatment, and ultimately die. In situations where such a person comes from a financially deprived background, their ultimate deaths may leave their loved ones like children and spouses poor and homeless. If it is the wish of the patient to die early when they may die ultimately, such a wish should be granted. However, strict regulations must be introduced to control the act because doctors, patients, and family members of patients may end up misusing such provisions.

In conclusion, proponents of euthanasia front issues concerning suffering, death with dignity, and ethics of the right to die. They consider economic benefits associated with such practices against realistic societal expectations. Contrarily, opponents of the idea belief that life is very sacred and must be preserved. While certain cases may circumstantially deserve assisted suicide, laws must be enacted to protect the practice from misuse.
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