

July 15/2005

To the Supreme Court of Canada

No one can defend himself, or herself against a jury with 5 confirmed guilty verdicts on it, as well as a school superintendent of the Catholic school system right from the start, facing the charges I was facing in the trial of me in 1994. The police and prosecutor didn't feel they had to confirm the school superintendent's verdict as guilty as they covertly did the others prior to the start of the trial. But were confident he would be in favor of delivering a guilty verdict that would delight the Catholic leadership's ethical, and moral precepts. These facts were clearly outlined in the trial of Saskatchewan Justice Department prosecutor Randy Kirkham, after I had been run through the judicial system, and convicted again.

Canadians want to have confidence in their Courts. This Court's very existence is an acceptance that lower Courts are applying rigid precepts to versions of facts. As my situation before you clearly shows aggressive police, and prosecutor tactics that deeply trouble most thinking Canadians as shown in the national surveys on pages 55 through 79 of my material clearly shows should not be endorsed, or perpetuated by any Court.

Impartiality has never existed on the benches I have faced.

Impartiality is not achieved when you people, the highest Court in our country are so eager to endorse, and perpetuate the fraudulently fabricated medical claims of the corrupt Saskatchewan Justice Department prosecutors.

What is the **identity** of the "more effective pain medication" this Court claims exists on lines 73, 325, and 661 of this Court's January 18/2001 decision on pages 146, 152, and 160 of my material?

What is the **identity** of the "better pain management" this Court this claims exists on lines 128, and 652 of this Court's January 18/2001 decision, on pages 148, and 160 of my material?

What is the **identity** of the medication this Court is referring to when it writes on lines 135, and 697 of this Court's January 18/2001 decision on pages 148, and 161 of my material; "a medically manageable physical or mental condition"?

You people are not a bunch of timid little alterboys with some dirty little secrets to keep. So quit acting like it.

The statement “It may be noted that the requirement involves a **realistic appreciation** of the alternatives open to a person” is this Court’s from line 530 of it’s January 18/2001 decision, on page 157 of my material.

This is your demand. So why can’t I get **“a realistic appreciation”** of this medical claim?

Being **imperfectible** as Justice Binnie is reported to have said of the Courts on page 206 of my material is only human.

To be incorrigibly imperfect is a fault I hope this Court can find the strength to overcome.