

December 4/2005

To the Supreme Court of Canada

On line 530 (page 157) of this Court's January 18/2001 decision the Court clearly writes; "It may be noted that the requirement involves **"a realistic appreciation of the alternatives open to a person"**. How can this Court possibly be upset, or sit boldly stone-like silent when I ask for **"a realistic appreciation of the alternatives"**, this Court claims **"was available"** to us, to treat what this Court felt was Tracy's **"medically manageable physical or medical condition"**?

"no Air of reality to any of the 3 requirements for necessity" Page 147 line 123

"more effective pain medication" line 73 page 146.

"better pain management was available" line 128 page 148.

"a medically manageable physical or mental condition" line 135, page 148.

"more effective pain medication" line 325, page 152.

"better pain management was available" line 652, page 160.

"more effective pain medication" line 661, page 160.

"a medically manageable physical or mental condition" line 697, page 161.

Many things were happening to Tracy. Many of these things were extraordinary. I don't think you have to be a doctor to follow along the many different things that are described by Dr. Dzus who was actually working on Tracy.

If this Court does not have **"a realistic appreciation of the alternatives"** that this Court claims **"was available"** to us after scolding me for not having **"a realistic appreciation of the alternatives open to a person"**. How can this Court possibly feel it can continue to endorse, and promote these fraudulent medical fabrications?

I am not asking this Court to endorse anything that I have done, but I do want this Court to quit endorsing the very dishonest claims the prosecutors have made.

The vast majority of disabled people, or their supposed spokes people have never endured ½ of the skeletal renovation Tracy had endured, To see these people cheer on this Court's ruling that the abuse to Tracy should continue is incredibly sadistic, and cruel.

I imagine working on a ruling like this takes the judges on this Court back to their childhood pleasures of pulling wings off of butterflies.

When the Hard Core Catholics wrote Prime Minister Chretien (page 185) “to express the support of the Catholic Health Association of Canada (CHAC) for the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Robert Latimer case. I’m sure this Court felt a divinely proficient with your work on us.

But when these Hard Core Catholic’s fearless leader Pope John Paul II could see what might happen to him, he got himself to the congress on gastroenterology in March of 2002. CNN reported:

“Telling the doctors that caring for patients “must take into the account not only the body but also the spirit,” John Paul said it was “presumptuous” to count just on scientific technique.”

““And, in this perspective, extreme measures at all costs, even with the best intentions, would be, in the end, not only useless, but not fully respectful of the patient who has reached the terminal stage,” The pope said.”

“He encouraged scientists to pursue research for new treatments, but reminded them that “one cannot forget that man is a limited and mortal being.””

““It’s thus necessary to approach the ill with that healthy realism which avoids generating in those who suffer the illusion of medicine’s omnipotence,” the pontiff said.”

“There are limits which can not be humanly overcome.”

A feeding tube cut into his stomach was not something these Hard Core Catholics felt their beloved Pope had to endure. Yet due to this Court’s inability to gain “a realistic appreciation” of Tracy’s medical condition she was obligated by law to get a feeding tube.

This Court wrote in your January 18/2001 decision: “**He had at least one reasonable legal alternative**: he could have struggled on, with what was unquestionably a difficult situation, by helping Tracy to live and by minimizing her pain as much as possible. The appellant might have done so by using a feeding tube to improve her health and allow her to take **more effective pain medication**”.

If this Court had had any respect for Tracy it would have taken the time to get “**a realistic appreciation of the alternatives open to a person**”.

Justice Arbour is quoted in the local prison magazine telling prison officials “to admit error without feeling that it is conceding defeat”, after a riot in a women’s prison

This Court’s decision is a foul application of authority consistent in intent, and with the goals of those who were covertly “confirming guilty verdicts” in the first trial of me.