

April 24/2005

To Prime Minister of Canada Paul Martin

You seem to be getting fairly good reviews on your handling of the sponsorship scandal. A person doesn't have to listen to very much of the Gomery inquiry to conclude that a lot of taxpayers money and trust has been squandered.

It is my hope that you continue to manage the country's many problems in an open and honest fashion.

If you were to focus your authority on the problems with the Supreme Court's January 18/2001 decision against me, you would find that the Supreme Court ruled that a 12 year old person who has already had 4 surgeries including 1 to insert 2 steel rod into her back. Must then have a feeding-tube cut into her stomach so that she can survive an operation to cut the top ¼th of her femur off. I know that the true facts of this situation have upset many morally conscious Canadians. These kinds of end of life decisions deserve more consideration than they have been given in my situation.

It is very clear that although there have been many politicians willing to talk in a very guarded terms about changing the law in end of life decisions. None of them have had the ability to do anything to address the serious abuse that people must legally endure before their death.

On line 659 [page [160](#)] the Supreme Court wrote: "The appellant might have done so by using a feeding tube to improve her health and allow her to take more effective pain medication, or he might have relied on the group home that Tracy stayed at just before her death. The appellant may well have thought the prospect of struggling on unbearably sad and demanding. It was a human response that this alternative was unappealing. But it was a reasonable legal alternative that the law **requires** a person to pursue before he can claim the defence of necessity."

Then some time later it is written on [page [206](#)] how Justice Binnie felt "scientifically illiterate" when deciding situations like we were in.

Yet when I contact the Supreme Court they are reluctant to identify the "more effective pain medication" or "better pain medication" they claim "was available".

The Supreme Court can not identify these medications because these medications do not exist. There were not going to be any types of medications prescribed for our daughter, other than regular strength Tylenol. But there were reasons why she could not be given “fairly powerful drugs” line 675 [page 136].

So if the Politicians won't recognize, and enact new legislation to keep the police and prosecutors from preying on the people stuck in these positions of not continuing on with drastic medical procedures that are not understood by the courts. But encourage these predators by intervening to uphold their charges against someone like me. It is fairly clear that my only hope is that some one of substantial influence such as you can step in and see that things are done in an honest way. It is my hope that you will ask the Supreme Court to take another look at their decision, and review if there is an actual medication that could fit the medication's qualities that their decision states exists, and the exact identity of that medication. If there is no medication as I'm sure the record before the Supreme Court will clearly show. All of the legal findings supported by the existence of this fraudulently fabricated medication should be eliminated from their decision.

It is my hope that you are serious about providing honest leadership of this country.

If you do take the time to read some of the more than 200 pages of material I am enclosing with this letter you will find on page 47 Professor Krutzen has written his insight on my situation:

“Legal justice and moral justice do not always coincide. Sometimes the law is morally blind – as this case tragically demonstrates – and when it is, it needs to be changed. **It is not because justice matters that we care, rather, it is because we care that justice matters.** Just when and how the law should be changed is a moral, not a legal, matter. It is not the law that determines what is morally right: it is what is morally right that determines what the law should be and how it should be interpreted and applied. This is why blind obedience to the law is morally objectionable.”

It should be troubling to you to see 2 prominent Professors Krutzen, and Lefcourt compare the actions used against us to circumstances and situations of authority faced by a couple of people from the Nazi era, Adolf Eichmann Page 52, and Dietrich Bonhoeffer page 80.

Your attention to these concerns would be greatly appreciated