

Robert Latimer

December 10/2002

To Federal Justice Minister Cauchon

Just as Richard D. Mosley, Q.C. Assistant Deputy Minister Criminal Law Policy and Community Justice Branch consistently points out in his letters on October 30/2001 page 9 “The Attorney General cannot speculate on what the Court meant by particular wording in the judgement.”, October 9/2002 page 179 “the Attorney General of Canada Cannot speculate on what the Supreme Court of Canada meant by particular wording in their judgement.” I know I must consistently communicate to you that this judgement is based on findings unsubstantiated by the evidence before the Court.

I believe your office would have access to the identity of the “**more effective pain medication**” the Supreme Court relied on to eliminate the Jury’s meaningful participation in deciding if my actions were criminal or not, if such a “**more effective medication**” did actually exist. Or if such a “**more effective medication**” were only a deceptive ploy your office would be able to ascertain the “more effective medication” is a fraud.

This is a very real legal instrument used in the attack on us. What is it?

On page 146 line 68 of the Supreme Court’s preamble of their January 18/2001 decision the Court speculates “It was thought that she experienced a great deal of pain. This could not be reduced by medication since this would conflict with her anti-epileptic medication and her difficulty in swallowing.”

The Supreme Court then goes on to introduce their key instrument they used to eliminate any meaningful participation of the jury in deciding if my actions were criminal or not by writing:

Page 146 line 71 “There was evidence that T could have been fed with a feeding-tube into her stomach, an option that would have improved her nutritional health, and that might also have allowed for **more effective pain medication** to be administered.”

The Supreme Court again speculates:

Page 152 line 318 “It was thought she experienced a great deal of pain, and the pain could not be reduced by medication since the pain medication conflicted with her anti-epileptic medication and difficulty in swallowing.”

The Supreme Court again asserts:

Page 152 line 323 “There was evidence that Tracy could have been fed with a feeding tube into her stomach, an option that would have improved her nutrition and health, and that might also have allowed for **more effective pain medication** to be administered.”

In the Supreme Court’s January 18/2001 decision the key instrument of their decision that eliminates any meaningful participation of the jury in deciding if my actions were criminal or not is mentioned on:

Page 146 line 73 “allowed for **more effective medication** to be administered.”

Page 148 line 128 “when better pain management was available.”

Page 148 line 130 “minimizing her pain as much as possible or by permitting the insertion of a feeding-tube”

Page 152 line 325 “**more effective pain medication**”

Page 160 line 652 “**better pain management was available.**”

Page 160 line 661 “**more effective pain medication**”

And again refers to their key instrument of this decision on:

Page 148 line 135 “a medically manageable physical or mental condition”

Obviously the Supreme Court was referring to “a more effective pain medication”. The Saskatchewan Government’s prosecutor Kenneth Mackay continues to promote “moreover, a feeding tube decreased the risks associated with administering more powerful pain killers such as difficulties with swallowing and aspirating stomach contents into her lungs.” As recently as April 24/2002 as shown on line 24 of [page 107 now page 87] of the booklet I sent you.

What medication are these people talking about? Why is it so difficult to get an answer to this question?

I am also including a March 14/2001 letter (seen on page 185) from a President Richard M. Haughian of a group of Catholics to Prime Minister Chretien which touts the Supreme Court’s findings on line 8 “a medically manageable physical or mental condition”. The Supreme Court’s decision based on these unsubstantiated fallacious claims empowers these religious extremists. These groups obviously have more influence over our judicial process than the average Canadian that participated in the many national surveys featured on [pages 72 to 96 now 55 to 79] of the booklet I sent you. I believe these religious extremist have shown their ability to interfere, and promote their beliefs from the jury selection I wrote about on line 11 of page 16 through to their letter of support I am sending you.

As you can tell from page 5 of the booklet I sent you I have been trying to discover the identity of the “**more effective pain medication**” so prominently featured in the January 18/2001 Supreme Court decision since June of 2001. I do expect to find a clear evaluation of the “**more effective medication**” used against me at some point in the future. I am convinced you or

your office have access to a true evaluation of this claim. Will you be sharing this evaluation with me?

I can certainly understand how the former Federal Justice Minister would later claim to have intervened “solely to support the constitutionality of the provisions of the Criminal Code that were challenged and did not present arguments on the other issues.”, in order to distance herself from the medical claims that I now question. But there can be little doubt that there was a common presence, and a common goal as the gang of my opponents spoke against me at the Supreme Court.

