

August 4/2005

To the Prime Minister of Canada Paul Martin

It is fairly common knowledge that you as Prime Minister can order a new trial in situations before the Courts or beyond such as mine. I believe a new trial of me should be ordered by you to allow the criminality or lack of criminality of my actions to be decided by a jury.

I believe a jury's meaningful participation has been eliminated from the decision to imprison me for life, by the Courts relying on fraudulently fabricated medical claims of Saskatchewan Justice Department prosecutors.

It has been repeatedly proven that the only thing that can possibly save me from a sentence of life imprisonment is a jury's not guilty verdict.

The clearest display of just how devious the police and prosecutors were came when RCMP corporal Bruce McLeod explained to the Kirkham trial how police set about "**confirming guilty verdicts**" using the questionnaire on page 46 of my material.

Of course I had been convicted a second time before Kirkham was ever put on trial in front of a judge.

The first trial was ruled unenforceable, by the Supreme Court, and I was left to defend myself again with no compensation from the perpetrators of the first naughty trial.

These trials cost a person a lot.

On to the next trial some 2 years later with a jury being left confused, and misled, but not enough to wash out their guilty verdict ruled the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court also ruled that the jury had no business deciding on if my actions were appropriate given the circumstances we faced. The Supreme Court backed up it's decisions by relying on fraudulently fabricated medical claims that I have been trying to get explained since June of 2001 some months after the January 18/2001 decision, just days after I read the decision. I understand that the Supreme Court does not have to give reasons for it's decisions. But when the Supreme Court does give reasons for it's decisions I fell it should be responsible for the veracity of their reasons.

I believe Canadians in general, and at least the majority of Canadians were cheated, and misrepresented by the Courts in their deciding that a jury can not have any meaningful participation in deciding the criminality of a person's actions in circumstances such as we faced

in late 1993. The national surveys on pages 55 to 79 of my material show that a lot of ordinary Canadians have been grossly misrepresented by the Supreme Court's January 18/2001 decision.

Legal charges such as the ones I faced should be decided by a jury. The Courts have proven their inability to decide my situation with honest, well understood facts. Instead Justice Binnie a participating judge in this Supreme Court decision is left explaining that the Courts actions in situations such mine with this logic on page 206 of my material:

“Most of the people in law, if not in this room, probably went into law to get away from things like chemistry and physics and mathematics, There is a kind of pride in scientific illiteracy through the profession.”

As you can see from my material, I have been fairly active in trying to get a clear identity of the “more effective pain medication”. This medication is clearly evident in all 3 of the reasons the Supreme Court clearly states it needs to bar a jury from considering a defense of necessity.

Or in other words the existence of this “more effective pain medication” is ample reason to bar the jury from deciding my actions were appropriate.

When the Supreme Court relies on such medical claims to bar a jury from any meaningful input into deciding the criminality of an individual. Such legal findings, or legal instruments should be well documented, and well understood by all involved.

There appears to be no interest in discovering the identity of the “more effective pain medication” we were told to rely on by the Supreme Court of Canada.

This is not just a mistake in law, but an instance where Saskatchewan Justice Department prosecutor's fraudulently fabricated medical claims have been endorsed preventing a true description of the circumstances we faced.

This situation should not be allowed to continue. You have the authority to order a new trial of me, and it should not take place in Saskatchewan. If a new trial were to be held here on southern Vancouver Island where I am now imprisoned, the Saskatchewan Justice Department prosecutors would not have the home Court advantage that has allowed them to “confirm guilty verdicts” as easily as in the past.

The criminality, or lack of criminality of me should be decided by a jury made up of ordinary Canadians, properly selected. And that jury should be allowed to consider the defence of necessity, or if my actions were appropriate given the circumstances we faced.

I am not alone in wanting your office to have a go at trying to bring forth a decision that would be more in line with the moral foundations of average Canadians.

In the Supreme Court's January 18/2001 decision they write on line 1132 on page 172 of my material:

“The executive will undoubtedly, if it chooses to consider the matter, examine all of the underlying circumstances surrounding the tragedy of Tracy Latimer that took place on October 24, 1993”.

If you are an honest person, you will not allow these very dishonest tactics to prevail under your leadership.