

[Sample Track Changes document](#)

[Shared with permission from Gurvir Singh](#)

Controversies surrounding MAID: Is MAID beneficial for the society

Gurvir Singh (Student Id-301313256)

Centennial College

College Communications 2 (ESL) (SEC-010)

Controversies surrounding MAID: Is MAID beneficial for the society

Introduction

Is MAID a Hobson's Choice in disguise? People have been asking this question since the emergence of MAID. The article "Liberty or equality? Unrestricted access to medically assisted death endangers vulnerable people" by Ruth Enns was published in the CBC on 12th October 2019. This article intends to familiarize the audience with changes introduced to Bill C-14 back in 2019 and the writer's concerns regarding the same. This article lacks concrete evidence and is biased.

Summary

In this essay, Enns (2019) discusses the Quebec Superior Court Ruling regarding MAID and the changes it introduced to the restrictions for people with disabilities to access MAID. According to the author, this ruling does not bring equality to the physically challenged and instead makes them more exposed to social pressure to die with dignity. She also believes these changes create a huge power imbalance between the medical professionals and the person requesting death. She provides readers with examples of people, like Roger Foley and Candice Lewis's Mother, who were offered MAID involuntarily and accused of being selfish upon refusal. The author concludes the essay by saying unhindered individual choice cannot coexist with fairness. She also claims that impartiality unites us, whereas unopposed choice divides us into groups, uninfluenced and unassisted.

Response Segment 1: Bias

This article has a heavy bias against the usefulness of MAID to the physically challenged and focuses too much on the problems or stress they may have to go through because of it. She fails to mention any benefits that the changes may have introduced. Enns (2019) asserts that these changes create a power imbalance between the medical professionals and the patients and does not touch upon the fact that it reduces a patient's suffering immensely. Her remarks are defamatory and question the credibility of doctors all over Canada. Enns also portrays the changed restrictions as destructive for humanity without considering their advantages. Hence, restricting the readers from discovering any hidden benefits that these changes may have introduced for the targeted audience. She also assumes that people with disabilities can take care of themselves and does not consider the pain that physically challenged people may go through on a day-to-day basis. A part of society can feel neglected and unsupported because of this. Enns herself is a polio survivor and should have discussed the other half of the story to attract readers and maintain a neutral tone.

The article would have been more impartial had the author discussed about the people who benefitted from the new laws.

Response Segment 2: Lack of Evidence

The article is an opinion piece, and the writer does not provide enough evidence to support her thoughts. Moreover, the examples used by the author do not convey the same message as intended by the writers of the hyperlinks included in her paper. , . Enns (2019) in the start

provides the readers with a hyperlink which says that many people had a sigh of relief after the new laws were introduced. This hyperlink also includes examples of people like Heather Ross who support these changes. This weakens Enns argument and indicates faulty use of evidence. The writer's suggestion that removing safeguards will make people with disabilities more vulnerable to social pressure is just an opinion unsupported by any statistics or facts. This deficiency of data makes the write-up harder to trust and reduces the writer's authority. Enns also uses the term 'Hobson's Choice' to describe the changes to the MAID restrictions suggesting to readers that the physically challenged have no real choice and MAID is being imposed on them. This spreads misinformation and can potentially cause widespread resentment. Had the author used concrete examples and presented the anecdotes that supported her stance; the article would have been easier to trust. Doing so should have also ensured that the article has compelling facts and instances to prove the author's credibility.

Conclusion

The article "Liberty or equality? Unrestricted access to medically assisted death endangers vulnerable people", is an opinion-based essay and reflects the author's biased stance and does not include enough evidence for the readers to trust the writer. Enns could have used more stats and facts to support her opinions and make her essay meticulous. The author discusses the potential problems a physically challenged person may come through due to the changes introduced by the Quebec Court Ruling and how it will make them vulnerable to social pressure. In conclusion, for a piece of writing to be engaging and have a mass appeal, the writer must

make clever use of vocabulary, shreds of evidence, facts, and statistics. Deductive reasoning and cohesive essay formation make for a good read and helps writers with good delivery. This also aids the writers to come up with a clear and concise response that makes a deep impact on the readers. Enns's write-up could have been easier to recommend had she used a few more anecdotes and stats and had it discussed both aspects and represented people from both schools of thought.

References

- Ruth Enns (2019, October 12). Liberty or equality? Unrestricted access to medically assisted death endangers vulnerable people. Retrieved January 19, 2023, from <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/opinion-ruth-enns-maid-disability-1.5318540>
- Steve Rukavina (2019, September 11). Quebec judge overturns parts of federal, provincial laws on medically assisted dying. Retrieved January 19, 2023, from, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/medically-assisted-dying-law-overturned-quebec-1.5279067>

