RE: DRAFT POLICY "PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS"

Dear Members of the Consultations Committee,

I have read the above Draft Policy, and I think that you have failed to protect your physicians' conscientious objections in your haste to accommodate patients' wishes. There has to be a balance between the two which does not mean that anyone should have to violate their conscience to accommodate someone else.

I am specifically referring to Sections 3, 10 and 11 of the above Draft Policy, which suggest that physicians who do not perform certain procedures themselves have to refer a patient to someone who does.

I can't imagine someone who becomes a physician to heal and help people being asked to take a life (or end someone's life) and having to say, "I don't believe in doing this but just go next door and they'll do it for you." That act of referral is just as much a violation of conscience as performing the
Surely there are enough doctors who are willing to accommodate a patient's request for any controversial form of treatment, without involving the ones who would object in conscience.

Why can your website or some other website not list doctors who will and doctors who will not perform certain procedures?

Why is it not the patient's choice to have the choice to register with a doctor who thinks the same way?

Why are patients not responsible for finding a doctor they are comfortable with, without having the supposed 'right' to force someone else to violate their conscience?

This is not discrimination against a person, but objection to a procedure.

I do not see why there is not room for everyone in your policy, ranging through the whole spectrum of differing opinions on matters.

I know this letter is not well-written, but I hope I have made clear that you must, in writing the actual policy, protect your physicians and defend their right not to violate their conscience, even with an act of referral.