

LETTERS

Law catching up with ethics

The position on the physician's responsibility for determining when cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) can be withheld without consent that is set forth in the article by Downar and colleagues published in *CMAJ*¹ was adopted as Canadian Medical Association policy in 1994 (updated in 1995) in a joint statement with the Canadian Nurses Association and the Catholic Health Association of Canada, with input from the Canadian Bar Association.² It reads in part, "People who almost certainly will not benefit from CPR are not candidates for CPR, and it should not be presented as a treatment option." It's comforting to see instances of law catching up with ethics.

John R. Williams PhD

Former director of ethics, Canadian Medical Association (1991–2003); Faculty of Medicine, School of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ont.

■ Cite as: *CMAJ* 2020 February 3;192:E123.
doi: 10.1503/cmaj.74271

References

1. Downar J, Close E, Sibbald R. Do physicians require consent to withhold CPR that they determine to be nonbeneficial? *CMAJ* 2019;191:E1289-90.
2. Joint statement on resuscitative interventions (update 1995). *CMAJ* 1995;153:1652A.

Competing interests: None declared.