

LA PRESSE+, October 26, 2021 edition,

CHILDHOOD IMMUNIZATION

THE DILEMMAS OF A FAMILY PHYSICIAN IN TIMES OF COVID-19

RENÉ LAVIGUEUR

DOCTOR, SAINTE-ANNE-DES-MONTS

Family doctor, I am double vaccinated and my testimony brings the insight of a man in the field who is grappling with the daily dilemmas caused by the coronavirus crisis.

One-track thinking and the fear that 19 months of media campaign have brought about have cruelly and unnecessarily divided families, professionals, in short, all of society. This way of thinking forbids any discussion and any debate for fear of reprisals.

A CODE OF ETHICS CHALLENGED

A family physician is subject to a code of ethics that includes articles aimed at protecting the public and respecting patients' right to free and informed consent.

I am, as a family doctor, faced with agonizing choices when the application of these principles' conflicts with the political management of this pandemic, a management advocated by public health authorities and supported by the Collège des médecins du Québec. My entire practice has been built around a constant concern: to do no harm. My primary allegiance is to the mother, the child and anyone who seeks my help. I am therefore consulted on the subject of childhood vaccination, vaccine safety, mandatory vaccination, and vaccine complications.

I see on a daily basis, as do psychologists and social workers, the damage not only of COVID-19, but also of its management.

To respect my patients' right to informed consent, here is what I feel I should tell them regarding childhood vaccination:

"Do you agree that your child should receive the messenger RNA vaccine? This vaccine is different from any other vaccine you know. This vaccine has an uncertain risk/benefit balance in healthy children without risk factors. The manufacturer does not know the long-term effects of its product. It is not recommended by the World Health Organization and is not yet approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration nor Health Canada for use in children aged 5 to 11. It is offered to children in hopes that it will help limit the contamination of the elderly and/or vulnerable with COVID-19. Do you accept that your child receives this vaccine?"

One could have added that mortality in children aged 0-9 years has been zero since the beginning of the pandemic (INSPQ data). The risk/benefit balance is therefore difficult to defend for this age group, as it is for young people in general.

I would like to be able to say this freely, without risk of reprisal. The doctor, like the parents, should be able to defend the "precautionary principle" and cautiousness regarding children's health.

The vaccinated, just like the unvaccinated, can harbor and transmit the virus. Children are bad propagators of the virus in the community. So how can we justify forcing children to be vaccinated?

There is a serious ethical problem with forcing vaccination on healthy children for the hypothetical purpose of benefiting another segment of the population (the elderly with comorbidities). Haven't children suffered enough already? Why risk compromising their health further?

Parents had the painful choice of signing their children's vaccination authorization or condemning them to exclusion and rejection. It is therefore a mandatory vaccination, but that isn't displayed as such. Our code of ethics requires "free consent" for any decision, meaning without pressure, threat, or constraint. How can I advise the concerned parent who does not want his or her child to be marginalized? What is gained by this vaccination? Why punish the unvaccinated child?

A VACCINE THAT AVOIDS ALL MONITORING

I treat adults with severe complications following this vaccine's administering. For a population of 11,300 habitants, I have already reported to Public Health two deaths, strokes, Bell's palsy, menstrual bleeding, palpitations, and extreme fatigue following the administering of these vaccines.

Thousands of deaths, tens of thousands of serious side effects due to the vaccine have been reported around the world. Why ignore, in Quebec, the risks associated with these vaccines? If the manufacturer is not responsible for anything, if he was able to negotiate a legal immunity, then who will be responsible for the very real damages of these vaccines?