

Robert Latimer

July 30/2001

To the Premier of Saskatchewan Lorne Calvert

I am writing you to get an identity of the more “**effective pain medication**” the Supreme Court relied on to eliminate the defense of necessity being put to a jury in their January 18/2002 decision against me. The Court claims to have discovered the “**more effective pain medication**” in the process of eliminating the jury’s participation in deciding if what I did was right or wrong.

I believe you are in a position to achieve an understanding as to whether such a medication exists or not, and if such a medication exists, what is it? The “**more effective pain medication**” is the most vital element of the entire decision.

Enclosed is a booklet of the various attempts I have made to understand the Supreme Court’s decision.

On page 99 I write of how the Supreme Court demands objectivity in “The evaluation of the seriousness of the harms must be objective.” If the Supreme Court is so objective, what is the “**more effective pain medication**” they claim was available for Tracy? I also wrote of this “**more effective medication**” on pages 11 to 16, 25 to 32, 42, [120, and 121 now 100, and 101]. Dr. Stewart also writes his medical opinions on the Supreme Court’s decision on pages 19 to 21.

On pages [85 to 90 now 68 to 73] of the booklet a June 22/2001 Leger Marketing survey of 1507 Canadians clearly shows that the vast majority of Canadians surveyed (75.5%) oppose the

prosecution of someone in my position. It is clear people have very clear opinions as to how they want to endure their final days of life should their health deteriorate to a terrible state.

It is difficult to believe these very same people would want to face the very same judicial process I faced in the rare event they or one of their family member's health should deteriorate to such horrible circumstances as Tracy was enduring and they chose to end the suffering. The judicial system I faced tolerated some very aggressive underhanded tactics designed to achieve a guilty verdict. I have written about these tactics on pages 5, 16, 17, 34 to 37, 46, and [124, 125, now 104, and 105], professor Krutzen writes about on pages 49, 50, 51, [65, and 67 not included in this revision].

To me you don't seem like the kind of person that would be as aggressive as the prosecutors working under your government have been in achieving a guilty verdict against me. On pages 36 and 37, I describe how prosecutors Schnell and Mitchell deliberately misled the courts. Their bogus claims are clearly not consistent with Dr. Dzus' testimony.

In the event the Solicitor General's office finds itself considering its prerogatives in my situation, it is my belief that the true facts should be presented. Not only for the Authorities, but also for the vast majority of Canadians that are more capable of appreciating our circumstances, and can see how our problems could potentially be something they might face in the future.

How can these aggressive prosecutors be allowed to alter the medical facts to achieve their goals?

I believe the Supreme Court's January 18/2001 decision was an insult to fundamental democratic principles.