Whereas, Physicians have a First Amendment right to express their good faith views on medical therapies and other medical issues; and

Whereas, Physicians’ rights to express their good faith views on medical issues should not be lost because those views are expressed at seminars or other programs at which the physicians are paid by the sponsor; and

Whereas, Physicians have been, and increasingly are being, sued for doing nothing more than expressing their views on such topics as use of opioids in treating chronic pain and use of marijuana for medical treatment purposes; and

Whereas, Lawsuits challenging the expression of a physician’s opinion on medical issues are often directed against key opinion leaders in the particular medical specialty; and

Whereas, The defense of cases in which physicians are sued for expressing their good faith views on medical issues can be very expensive, can cost more than the available insurance coverage, can cause significant anxiety, and can divert the defendant physicians from their practices; and

Whereas, The mere bringing of these types of suits will exert a chilling effect on the willingness of physicians to speak out in good faith on such controversial issues as a woman’s right to choose termination of pregnancy, treatment of Attention Deficit Disorder, the role of marijuana in medical treatment, use of opioids to treat chronic pain, and the efficacy of annual mammograms and PSA screening; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That our American Medical Association strongly oppose litigation challenging the exercise of a physician’s First Amendment right to express good faith opinions regarding medical issues (New HOD Policy); and be it further

RESOLVED, That our AMA’s House of Delegates encourage the AMA Litigation Center to provide such support to a constituent or component medical society whose members have been sued for expressing good faith opinions regarding medical issues as the Litigation Center deems appropriate in any specific case. (New HOD Policy)
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