

Robert Latimer

November 22/2002

To Senator Sharon Carstairs

In a January 24/2002 letter from your office to Mr. Anthony W. Fereday of Ottawa you explained to him: “However, there was some consideration given by prosecutors to the special circumstances of the Latimer case, as they negotiated a lesser charge for Mr. Latimer during his original trial.” How did you learn of this negotiation of a lesser charge?

Robert Latimer

March 9/2003

To Senator Sharon Carstairs

I have not received a reply to my November 22/2002 letter asking you how you learned of the “negotiations or a lesser charge” your January 24/2002 letter to Mr. Anthony W. Fereday mentions. I am enclosing a copy of the letter I sent you on November 22/2002 [page 192].

When I read your January 24/2002 letter to Mr. Anthony W. Fereday it was the first time I was made aware of the negotiations your letter speaks of. Your letter to Mr. Anthony W. Fereday was very vague about the substance of the negotiations, but I would definitely like to know more about these negotiations. Who was negotiating what? I would certainly not deal with them for I knew them as the bunch of jury rigging perjurers they eventually proved themselves to be.

In yesterday’s newspaper Supreme Court Justice Ian Binnie was quoted as speaking to a group in Toronto about how the Supreme Court, and Lawyers in general were not that interested in science. And that is what led them to conclude with no credible reason that there was a “**more effective pain medication**” that could have been administered to Tracy. To him it was just a “side issue”. There can be no doubt that there are a lot of powerful people in Ottawa that are not concerned about the accuracy of their work. Given the extreme results that I have to endure I would appreciate more accuracy from such careless people.