Dear Friend,

Guilt is a feeling we're all familiar with.

It is tied to beliefs about what is right and wrong, moral and immoral. Guilt that convicts us of real sin is a tremendous gift from God. We were all created with conscience as part of the framework of our souls (Rom. 2:15). Every wise Christian wants to develop a healthy conscience – a clean heart and right spirit (Ps. 51:10) – that is informed by God’s divinely revealed truth.

From experience, we know that our conscience condemns us when we do wrong, triggering feelings of guilt, shame, anguish, remorse, anxiety, disgrace and even fear. However, when we follow our conscience, it commends us, bringing joy, peace, self-respect and well-being. Our God-given conscience was intended to be a crucial tool in maintaining standards of right and wrong in individuals and society as a whole.

However, as our culture continues to embrace the excesses of self-importance, the very concept of guilt is considered by many to be primitive, obsolete and unproductive – a disorder that robs people of their self-esteem. Instead of fighting for freedom of conscience, they seek freedom from conscience. They want to do what is right in their own eyes (Deut. 12:8; Judg. 17:6), free from any concerns over the need to treat one another with dignity and respect (Mt. 25:31-46).

This dangerous mentality has entered into our health care system.

Many physicians in Canada believe that doctor-assisted suicide is tantamount to murder and want nothing to do with it. But now that doctor-assisted suicide is legal in Canada, attention has turned to whether healthcare providers and facilities should be forced to participate in hastening the deaths of their patients, even if it means compromising their integrity, morality and ethics.

Pro-euthanasia advocates are now working towards pressuring doctors who have objections to participating in the killing of another human being to either ignore their convictions or to get out of the profession. They don’t feel doctors should have the right to conscientious objection – the right to refuse to perform a service that they feel violates their ethics or morals.

But isn't taking steps to ensure that our medical professionals are morally neutral a ludicrous way to try to make our society a better place? Doctors are trained to exercise wisdom, discernment and good judgment in prescribing suitable treatment for their patients. Who really believes that requiring our medical professionals to set aside their moral values and to act like unthinking machines will help in achieving optimal patient care?

“So I strive always to keep my conscience clear before God and man.” Acts 24:16
Federal legislation for assisted suicide states that no one should be compelled to participate in euthanasia. However, one province is already ignoring this directive. In Ontario, doctors are being told to help people end their lives or risk losing their jobs. Meanwhile, other provinces are working to find alternative ways to ensure timely access to patient services without having to infringe upon the doctors’ freedom of conscience and religion as protected under Canada’s Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (CPSO) has passed a policy that requires doctors to either perform the medical service themselves or to refer the patient to someone who will, meaning that doctors cannot choose to opt out due to conscientious objections. For conscientious objectors, providing a referral for a procedure like doctor-assisted suicide is no different morally and ethically than killing the patients themselves. The effect of CPSO’s requirement is that doctors who uphold the sanctity and dignity of human life from conception to natural death are being told to capitulate or to leave the profession.

Adding fuel to the fire, two pro-euthanasia bioethicists from Canada and Britain have recently called for a complete ban on doctors’ rights to conscience objection in Canada. They suggest that all doctors should be required to personally ensure that any lawful medical procedure be performed for patients who request and qualify for them, despite any personal moral or religious objections the doctors may have about the procedure. They have said: “If this leads to feelings of guilty remorse or them dropping out of the profession, so be it.”

They’ve even suggested that medical schools should screen out potential applicants who might not be able to ignore their moral convictions and put a patient’s desire ahead of their own integrity. Can you imagine a medical school applicant being rejected for showing too high of a regard for human life?

The EFC is joining an EFC-affiliated organization, the Christian Medical and Dental Society of Canada, and two other physician groups to challenge CPSO’s policy that requires doctors to provide referrals against their conscientious objections. The Ontario Divisional Court will hear the judicial review this coming February.

The EFC is also urging the Ontario government to extend conscience protection to long-term care facilities and nursing homes in Ontario who may be compelled by the province to facilitate or allow euthanasia and assisted suicide on their premises.

We must take a stand for the freedom of medical professionals to heal and not kill, and for the ability of health care facilities to honour that same mission and purpose. Please consider partnering with us in this fight. We can’t do it without your prayerful and financial support.

Sincerely,

Bruce Clemenger
President