

Dr. Dave Webster
Department of Diagnostic Imaging
Health Sciences North
41 Ramsey Lake Road
Sudbury ON
P3E 5J1

March 22 2018

Ms. Christine Elliott
Patient Ombudsman of Ontario
393 University Ave
Suite 1801
Toronto, ON
M5G 1E6

**Re. Complaint re. Cancer Care Ontario's PET Scan Policy, Case File#
201700672**

AN EXAMPLE OF:

EXCELLENT CARE FOR ALL IN ONTARIO

Dear Ms Elliott

As you are aware, I sent a series of questions to your 'Council' dated January 9th regarding the matters referred to above. I have yet to receive an acknowledgement or response. Based on my most recent email from your office dated February 16th, Ms Currie is no longer on this case. However I was also reassured in this email that this would be dealt with in short order.

Last week I met with two of "Carol's" children to discuss the 'lack of response' from your office. They are fully aware of the history of the Ontario Ombudsman's Office of refusing to respond to requests for clarification on their rulings involving PET. They are most anxious, and insistent that we get an official response and detailed answers to the relevant questions we have submitted for clarification on your rulings on this case.

In the case of the other patient it is even more imperative that we get answers to these questions as soon as possible. His cancer is progressing and he will die sooner rather

than later from his disease. His case, also handled entirely within the confines of an “Ontario Public Hospital”, was mismanaged from day one.

As you are also aware, and have no trouble with, I am being threatened by the Senior Executives of Cancer Care Ontario and the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario [CPSO] because of my advocacy for patients, and in particular for my efforts to prevent what happened to these patients in an “Ontario Public Hospital”. Here is part of my response to the CPSO.

Professionalism Policy

I believe that my advocacy complies with the College’s Policy Statement #3-16, *Physician Behaviour in the Professional Environment* (the “Professionalism Policy”). I freely admit that I fiercely advocate for better PET access for my patients. Nonetheless, I have always strived to do so in a respectful, courteous and civil manner.

The Professionalism Policy states that a “physician’s primary responsibility is to act in the best interest of the individual patient”. I care deeply for the needs of my patients, and indeed all of Ontario patients. In advocating for PET access in Ontario, I believe I embody the key values of professionalism articulated in the College’s Practice Guide: compassion, service, altruism, and trustworthiness. I also believe that I am upholding the reputation of the medical profession by first and foremost always acting in the best interests of my patients.

It goes without saying that you, Ms Elliott, are acting as a Public Servant with a very critical theoretical role in dealing with issues facing Ontario patients on a daily basis, and in our Public Hospitals. Thus it should not be necessary to point out that you are required to be fully public, open and transparent in your dealings with these cases. I have given these people my word that I will not rest until they get a ‘proper response’ to questions they are entitled to have answers to from Ontario’s First Patient Ombudsman.

Therefore I am once again asking on behalf of those impacted by your rulings in these cases that you deal with the issues promptly and that clear and document backed as necessary answers are supplied to the questions and points of clarification regarding your ruling that we have submitted.

Regards

Dr. Dave Webster