

Government won't move fast on Court ruling

Regarding the right-to-die decision by the Supreme Court of Canada, allow me to submit the following observation. Those who are against it need not worry long sleepless nights over the issue, and those who are for it may rest assured that there will be many hundreds, if not thousands, wanting to take advantage of this ruling and yet suffer a natural demise in agony and misery. Here is the issue: The court has given our government one year to implement legislation to allow the right to assisted suicide. Justice Minister Peter McKay already let it be known that he is in absolutely no hurry to draft such a law, which in any case will take a lot of time to go through the parliamentary process of committees and three readings before Royal ascent is given, and McKay knows it.

In, at the latest, seven months from now an election will be called at which time anything not signed into law will die on the order paper. It will then become an election issue and the opposition parties will seize upon this opportunity to promise the majority of citizens, who are in favor of such a law, to implement it sometime during their mandate, should they get elected.

Of course, when assuming office they will claim a host of more urgent things requiring attention, and then, by about their second or third year in power, will they try to tackle this right-to-die issue, which after finally having been signed into law will have another year hence built in before taking effect, so that in typical Canadian fashion, the public can get used to the new reality.

As a side effect, we may get a party to govern us, which otherwise very few wanted, elected on a single polarizing issue, such as what the Ontario citizenry currently have to suffer through.

Back to the Supreme Court, which certainly knew about the impending general election and that anything dragged out beyond seven months must fail.

The people of course may accuse McKay, Prime Minister Harper and perhaps the entire government of being in contempt of (Supreme) Court. But will they really have to answer such a charge or suffer any kind of penalty? Of course not! For just what enforcement powers does our Supreme Court have?

We may also, later this fall, get a minority government, which may not last a full term and never get around to addressing this issue at all, and so years will go on. Therefore, this decision is totally meaningless.

Having abandoned leadership on this issue, the Conservatives will eventually sit in opposition only to pounce on that law when it's introduced years hence.

I am putting my money on a trip to compassionate Switzerland in a few years for want of an alternative.

Wulf Graunitz,
Palgrave
-30-