6. Advocacy for adequate terminal care is an important role for women's health care providers. The indignities of impoverishment are more common in women of all ages. They are linked to lack of access to adequate end-of-life care at home or in hospital. Bearing in mind the over-riding wishes of the dying woman, every effort should be made not to exclude family and friends from the dying process. 10. When a dying woman prefers to die at home, every effort should be made within the practicality of the situation, medical or social, to comply with her wish and to maintain good palliative care in that environment. 11. Women are particularly vulnerable to suffer inadequate access to optimum pain management by virtue of poverty and low social status. Medical ethicists serve as advisors to hospitals and other health-care institutions. They have also served as advisors to government at various levels. For example, experts in medical ethics...
assisted the United States government from 1974 to 1978 as members of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Medical Research. Medical ethics has even become part of the landscape in the commercial world of science. An increasing number of firms involved in biotechnology (the business of applying biological and genetic research to the development of new drugs and other products) regularly consult with medical ethicists about business and research practices. In these two situations killing is a method of treatment. It is argued that the doctrine cannot apply to the care of the dying. Firstly, doctors are obliged to harm patients in order to do good to them. Secondly, patients should make their own value judgments about being mutilated or killed. The prohibition of euthanasia must derive from a belief that direct killing of the innocent is supremely and always wrong, in a way that dreadful mutilations are not. That belief may or may not be true. The patient should decide for himself. One intuitive answer is that patients should be treated as they wish, provided the law, which protects us all, allows it. For these three reasons the doctrine is irrelevant to euthanasia.