

Jo-Ann Willson

From: Jo-Ann Willson
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 12:17 PM
To:
Cc: President
Subject: RE: Message #17 re: covid-19

Dear Dr.

Regarding your email of August 26, 2021 below, it is very clear that you bring a great deal of passion to the subject of mandatory vaccination. However, that is not always the best guide when formulating professional correspondence – including when directed to the President of the regulatory college to which you belong.

I remind you that as a member of CCO, you are obliged to uphold and act in accordance with the standards and guidelines that govern the profession; especially in this instance CCO Guideline G-009: Code of Ethics, and specifically section 11, which states: *“Chiropractors shall engage in professional, respectful communications with other members and health professionals and not engage in any in-person or online bullying, intimidation or harassment.”* S-020: Cooperation and Communication with CCO is also relevant.

Your use of an expletive (even if modified) is neither respectful nor professional. It is also not lost on anyone that the convention of typing sentences in uppercase in online communication is well understood to be the equivalent of shouting. Both swearing and shouting, whether online or in person, are completely unacceptable.

CCO has provided effective leadership in ensuring public safety throughout the pandemic response as demonstrated by the actions undertaken in concert with the Ministry of Health over the past two years. At this time, no other health regulatory college is mandating vaccines for regulated health professionals *with the exception of* health professionals in specific settings (hospitals, long term care homes etc.) as identified in Ministry bulletins and directives. That *may* change, and we will be monitoring all developments on an ongoing basis. As you know, any policy decisions, including policy decisions relating to vaccination, are made by full Council, comprised of both chiropractors from across the province and public members appointed by government and all policy decisions are made through the lens of public protection.

CCO does not “hide” behind the statutes as you allege – on the contrary, it derives its legitimacy and legislative authority through them. That authority extends to the requirement for professional and respectful communication.

Jo-Ann Willson, B.Sc., M.S.W., LL.B.
Registrar & General Counsel

***Note Address Change**

College of Chiropractors of Ontario
59 Hayden St., Suite 800
Toronto, ON M4Y 0E7
Tel: (416) 922-6355 ext. 111
Fax: (416) 925-9610
E-mail: jwillson@cco.on.ca
Web Site: www.cco.on.ca

CONFIDENTIALITY WARNING:

This e-mail including any attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only for the person(s) named above. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me immediately by reply e-mail and delete all copies including any attachments without reading it or making a copy. Thank you.

436(b)

From: \ ...
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2021 9:34 PM
To: President <President@cco.on.ca>; Jo-Ann Willson <jpwillson@cco.on.ca>
Subject: Message #17 re: covid-19

Dear Mr. President,

I read your message #17 re: covid-19 and take great issue with the lack of direction to the profession. In particular, I take issue with this excerpt:

"...I want to be very clear, however, that as the regulator it is not CCO's role to advocate for, or against, a vaccine mandate. The role of the College, as defined by statute, is to regulate all of chiropractic in Ontario in the public interest..."

Recommending sound public health practices to protect the public interest is within your mandate. Can you not take the lead on this important public health issue and recommend if not mandate that all chiropractors should be vaccinated to protect their or prospective patients? I am so sick of the f_____g lack of leadership from the CCO. Are you serious? You are hiding behind a statute? You have chiropractors who work in hospitals. What are they supposed to do when their regulator's policy conflicts with provincial requirements?

START SHOWING SOME LEADERSHIP ON THIS AND OTHER ISSUES TO TRULY PROTECT THE PUBLIC!