

# **And justice for none**

June 14, 1999

Today an impaired charge causing death is punishable with a maximum sentence of fourteen years. Grit legislation tabled in May would see that increased to a life sentence. Reform, eager to look tough on crime, backs the bill. Of all groups, the Bloc stopped it from being fast-tracked through the Commons.

“We cannot be more severe for drunk drivers than serial killers,” said MP Michel Gauthier. Paul Bernardo has been given one life sentence for the rape and murder of two school girls – Clifford Olson likewise for killing God only knows how many. Under this bill an otherwise law abiding citizen who had a few beers with his mates after work could end up in a cell next to either of the above for an equal period of incarceration.

The same bill raises the maximum sentence for causing injury while driving impaired to ten years. There’s a man in prison for multiple murder who’s up for parole after ten years! In another case, a young man was sentenced to five and a half for cold blooded murder but could be out in as little as two on good behaviour.

The latter incident not surprisingly involves a native perpetrator on whom our judiciary, since 1996, has been instructed to go soft because of his disadvantaged background. Some have been sentenced to an extended camping trip to get in touch with their roots or something. I’m entirely serious!

And for the record I’m not anti-native, but I’m all for equal treatment under the law. Currently a native could quite intentionally shank me (as in the aforementioned incident) and get little more than a slap on the wrist. If after this bill passes I accidentally kill that same native after having a few cold ones, I’m hooped. Hello, Paul!

People have beaten others to death, used drunkenness to get the charges reduced and been paroled in two years! Under these proposed changes one could be sentenced to ten for simply injuring someone. Not to belittle the latter crime, but there's a raging disparity here! Drunk driving is indefensible obviously, and it has to be severely punished, but if one is drunk and murders, the weapon used, be it a lead pipe or a car, is not overly relevant to the deceased and should not be a factor in sentencing. Nor should a man's skin colour be a consideration in a court of law. Ever. Full stop.

**UPDATE:** In the summer of '09, an acquaintance who lives on the outskirts of Edmonton answered a 5:00 p.m. knock at the door to get a knuckle sandwich right smack in the beak for his troubles. With the largest of three intruders then holding him at knife point, the others looted his home before the trio took their leave. When informed that the perps walking away from his home were native, the officer who took the call responded, and I quote, "Well... come in and fill out a report sometime."

So thirteen years after the Supreme Court was instructed to go soft on natives, assault and armed robbery by them didn't so much as warrant dispatching a cruiser! American Supreme Court justice Samuel Chase: "...where *justice is not impartially administered to all*; where *property is insecure*, and *the person is liable to violence without redress by law*, the people are not free."<sup>10</sup> The year was 1803, the above is quoted from a letter to Thomas Jefferson, and if that's the standard, we are enslaved indeed.