Rights and Freedoms
BULLETIN
Freedom: It's not just a word, it's a way of life

Welcome to the "New" Bulletin!

Please let me know your thoughts on the new format

Welcome to my weekly news Bulletin! As always, I will be including links to online resources **Text like this** means you can click on it to view a resource online if you want more information about the topic that is being discussed.

Now for the latest...

Welcome to the second Bulletin of the new year, where I'm continuing on with the changes started with last week's edition.

The goal is to make it a relevant resource for all of our Rights and Freedoms, not just gun issues.

Naturally, those stories always play a large part in what gets included here, but we have many more Rights than just the right to own the tools necessary to defend ourselves, right?

If you were subscribed to the Rights and Freedoms Bulletin last year you might remember the poll I did asking what people wanted to see, and what size they wanted the Bulletin to be.

The results were pretty much a split between keeping it the way it was at the time and making it bigger to include complete stories about more of the issues we face here in Canada.

So the goal this year is to help us all become more aware of the violations and attacks on our Rights and Freedoms.

I'll be attempting to include weekly updates on each of the following issues:

- ❑ *Freedom of Speech*
- ❑ *Privacy Rights*
- ❑ *Property Rights*
- ❑ *Search and Seizure*
- ❑ *Freedom of Association*
- ❑ *Human Rights Tribunals*
- ❑ *The Gun Registry and the Firearms Act*
- ❑ *Police Misconduct Cases*
- ❑ *Police Commendations* applauding when police take exceptional actions on our behalf
- ❑ *The Most Ridiculous Story of the Week* when it comes to the application of the law.

You will be appalled by this week's story of how Cranbrook RCMP abused a sober 82-year-old woman, then charged her with impaired driving.

- ❑ I plan on including a small section for *Video Clips of the Week* and *Articles Worth Reading*, a section where I'll place brief notes and links to stories that are worth checking out.
- ❑ Lastly I will be including information about *Recent Court Decisions* that either affect or affirm our individual Rights and Freedoms. Sometimes these will be included under a specific Right like they are this week; other times I'll be devoting space to a decision that I think is especially important.

A lot goes on *every week* in the never-ending battle for our Rights, Freedoms and Liberty.

It's a battle that requires us to know what's happening, who is trying to strip us of our Rights and Freedoms and what we can do to defend ourselves and our liberty from those who despise the very concept of Freedom.

It's a battle worth winning, don't you think?

It sounds like a lot, and maybe it is. Please let me know what you think!

Katey

Rights and Freedoms Bulletin (ISSN 1923-998X) is a public service of provided by KateysFirearmsFacts.com and KM Publishing Inc., P.O. Box 21004, Chilliwack, BC V2P 8A9

Freedom of Speech

Censorship Case at Carleton University Heats Up Posted on December 8, 2011 by jamesbshaw

December 8, 2011. Carleton University has brought a second motion to strike the lawsuit against them put forward by two pro-life Carleton students, Ruth (Lobo) Shaw and John Nicholas McLeod in February 2010.

In October 2011, Carleton University had (Lobo) Shaw and McLeod arrested for attempting to exhibit a pro-life display thereby violating the rights of the students to freedom of expression, freedom from discrimination and freedom of security.

The Statement of Claim, which is the document initiating the lawsuit, claims that Carleton University is acting as a delegate of the Province of Ontario in providing post-secondary education to the general public.

The University is attempting to strike the claim that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms applies to the University and its actions in the context of this litigation. They are also attempting to strike the claim that the University and members of its administration were negligent.

"Carleton University brought a motion to strike our Statement of Claim. If they are successful, our lawsuit will end. Our lawsuit survived their first motion to strike but, as they were unsuccessful in having our entire claim thrown out, they are now bringing this second motion on the same grounds.

Their actions give the impression that the University does not want this matter to be addressed by a court." said Ruth (Lobo) Shaw, former President of Carleton Lifeline and a Plaintiff in the lawsuit.

"Are members of Carleton University's administration concerned that an impartial judge would rule that the university violated the rights of their students?"

If Carleton University is successful in their motion, Carleton Lifeline's claims of negligence and violation of Charter rights will be dismissed.

"We are dismayed that the University is continuing with this aggressive approach" said John Nicholas McLeod, current President of Carleton Lifeline and a Plaintiff in the lawsuit.

"We had our rights violated and our voices censored. We decided to fight for our rights and Carleton University has employed tactics which are delaying a trial and increasing legal costs. In fact, in October, we were ordered to pay over $18,000 towards Carleton University's legal costs for the first motion they brought."

All relevant information regarding the censorship against Carleton Lifeline by Carleton University, including all court documents and video footage of the arrest, can be found at **www.carletonlifeline.wordpress.com**.

For more information please visit www.carleton-lifeline.wordress.com or contact Lifeline's lawyer Albertos Polizogopoulos at 613-241-2701.

Carleton University Student Arrested for Exercising Her Right to Freedom of Speech

Sun TV's Brian Lilley's segment on the lack of Freedom of Speech at Carleton University, where he speaks with the woman who was arrested for daring to exercise her Right to Freedom of Speech.

Carleton University: where we're is not interested in Free Speech, only in "*approved speech*."

http://www.sunnewsnetwork.ca/video/featured/prime-time/867432237001/lack-of-freedom-on-campus/1387141206001

Commenters Have a Field Day with Carleton University's Charter Hypocrisy

Jim Scharien

It takes a lot of gall to reference the Charter of Rights as an excuse to ban freedom of speech. It's obvious to anyone with a mind (which includes university students) that your position is not based on law, morality, or logic, so don't try to pretend that it is.

Leila Fawzi

I am outraged and incredulous that such actions are being taken in Canada. This is Canada not Zimbabwe - or is it????

I was under the impression that we lived in a democracy. Where is the right of academic freedom? Where should the rights of everybody - and I mean everybody - be more protected than on university campuses?

Privacy Rights

NS Court Find Warrantless Cellphone "Data Dumping" Unconstitutional

Two recent decisions from the Nova Scotia Provincial Court question police authority to confiscate and download the contents of an accused's cellphone incident to an arrest.

In R v Hiscoe and R v Dorey, the accuseds had their cellphones seized by police after both were arrested on suspicion of drug trafficking.

Following Hiscoe's arrest, the police viewed the most recent text messages on his phone, transcribing them shortly after.

In both cases, the police later sent the cellphones to a crime unit to have their entire contents downloaded and analyzed ("data dumping").

In separate applications to the court, Hiscoe and Dorey challenged the decision of the RCMP to seize their phones under s.8 of the Charter.

Summarizing his reasons for both decisions in Hiscoe, Justice Tuft held that viewing and transcribing a recent text message was reasonable in the circumstances and, therefore, viewing Hiscoe's most recent messages was lawful.

However, Justice Tuft went on to find that it was not reasonable for the police to download the entire contents of a cellphone without a warrant.

As such, the police violated Hiscoe and Dorey's s.8 rights by data dumping their phones.

Finding the conduct threatening to the administration of justice, the court subsequently excluded evidence obtained from the phones under s.24(2) of the Charter (apart from Hiscoe's recent messages).

Links to the full decisions for both R. v. Hiscoe and for R. v. Dorey can be found below:

R. v. Hiscoe - **http://www.courts.ns.ca/decisions_recent/documents/2011nspc84_mtd.pdf**

R. v. Dorey - **http://www.courts.ns.ca/decisions_recent/documents/2011nspc85_mtd.pdf**

Excerpt from R. v. Hiscoe

[107] I recognize that the officers in this case were acting under the impression that they were authorized to conduct the full content download of the cell phone and never addressed their minds to whether a search warrant was required. **It is difficult to criticize the officer for their actions.** (*What???*) Their duties did not include apprising themselves of the recent debate in the case law. **The lack of attention to the need to obtain a search warrant is more appropriately characterized as a systemic police issue.** The law is not clear that a full download is authorized and that the cautious approach is to obtain a warrant.

[108] While society's interest in adjudicating this case on its merits is important and the truth-seeking function is important it does not outweigh, in my opinion, the long-term interest in upholding the public confidence in the criminal justice system. Sometimes, where justified, exclusion of evidence is necessary and warranted by overriding considerations of justice. Justice Fish in R. v. Bjelland 73 at para. 65 quoted from Chief Justice Samuel Freeman of the Manitoba Court of Appeal, when he said:

The objective of a criminal trial is justice. Is the quest of justice synonymous with the search for truth? In most cases, yes. Truth and justice will emerge in a happy coincidence. But not always. Nor should it be thought that the judicial process has necessarily failed if justice and truth do not end up in perfect harmony ... [T]he law makes its choice between competing values and declares that it is better to close the case without all the available evidence being put on the record. We place a ceiling price on truth. It is glorious to possess, but not at an unlimited cost. "Truth, like all other good things, may be loved unwisely -- may be pursued too keenly -- may cost too much.

[109] **In my opinion the long-term repute of the administration of justice is better maintained by the exclusion of this evidence.** I am satisfied of that on the balance of probabilities. The accused's application is granted. The full content download, excluding the text messages retrieved by Constables Foley and Campbell within the lawful authority of the police, is excluded.

Tufts, J.P.C.

Search and Seizure Violations

Man acquitted after gun seized in illegal search. Police didn't prove air gun was weapon, judge rules

by Andrew Seymour, Ottawa Citizen

A man caught on video carrying an air gun was acquitted of firearms charges Tuesday after a judge ruled that the Crown hadn't proven a pellet gun seized during a warrantless and illegal search was either a weapon or an imitation firearm.

Ontario Court Justice Ann Alder said she wasn't convinced beyond a reasonable doubt the Crosman Model Pro77 air gun seized from Chris Dunn was being used as a weapon when he allegedly pointed it at a friend outside a Petro Canada station in April 2010.

The friend Dunn allegedly pointed the gun at testified that Dunn never pointed the gun at him and he never felt intimidated or threatened by it.

"*Simply having an air gun in one's possession does not make it a weapon*," said Alder.

Alder also had trouble finding that the pellet gun was an imitation fire-arm. An Ottawa police expert testified it resembled two different styles of nine-mm handguns, but Alder said she didn't hear enough about the weight, size or composition of the air gun to be convinced it qualified as an imitation firearm.

Following the acquittal, the judge said she had "*serious concerns*" about the warrantless Ottawa police search that resulted in the seizure of the pellet gun.

Alder said she would have ruled the search violated the 43-year-old Dunn's Charter rights not to be subject to unreasonable search and seizure, if she hadn't already found him not guilty.

Dunn's lawyer, Joshua Clarke, said outside of court his client willingly surrendered to a police tactical unit that came to his trailer to arrest him at gunpoint.

Following his arrest, an officer "*snooping around the property*" found and seized the air gun, Clarke said.

And so the long line of Charter abuses by the Ottawa Police carry on... with the victims once again paying all the court costs.

Here's the Ottawa Sun's take on the story.

Gun or not, judge aquits

By Tony Spears, Ottawa Sun

A gun isn't a firearm when it's not a weapon.

That particular legal principle saved Chris Dunn from count two of his charge sheet on Tuesday.

For good measure, Judge Ann Alder said the warrantless police search that uncovered the air gun was concerning.

Dunn, 43, was being tailed by provincial workplace insurance investigators on April 23, 2010.

They filmed him brandishing the Crosman Pro77 at a gas station and called police.

But to convict him for pointing a firearm, the Crown had to show the air gun was a firearm.

A police expert testified that it was — but a firearm is defined in the Criminal Code as "a barrelled weapon."

"Weapon" has its own definition: basically, something used or intended for use in killing, hurting or threatening someone.

"There is no evidence of Mr. Dunn's intent in this case," Alder said.

And so the gun wasn't a weapon and therefore wasn't a firearm.

Alder also acquitted on the other three charges, which hinged on whether the air gun was a replica firearm, as defined by the Code.

She conceded a "general" resemblance, but said it didn't meet the legal definition.

She then briefly addressed defence lawyer Joshua Clarke's Charter motion alleging unreasonable search.

"I do have serious concerns about the reasonableness of the search and the seizure of this air gun," Alder said.

tony.spears@sunmedia.ca

The Gun Registry

Government to gun owners: We made a mistake. Fix it for us or go to prison

Two small-calibre rifles have been suddenly reclassified by the RCMP-run Canadian Firearms Program. The rifles in question, the Armi Jager AP-80 and the Walther G22, are both unremarkable .22-caliber long guns. While any firearm is dangerous, .22-caliber firearms are among the weakest around — indeed, they're typically used to train rookie shooters basic firearm safety and operation.

Canadian law divides firearms into three categories, using complex technical criterion and a bevy of politically-motivated "exemptions", and citizens can only legally own firearms in the categories their licence covers.

No further licences are issued for the third and highest category, prohibited. By declaring a new exemption and moving these rifles from the non-restricted list — the category subject to the least controls — to the prohibited list, the RCMP has essentially banned them for all but a constantly shrinking group of Canadians who owned prohibited-class firearms before the current gun control legislation was passed under Jean Chrétien.

That's bad.

This is worse: Any citizen who already owns an AP-80 or G22, and does not already possess a rare prohibited-class licence, has been ordered to turn in their rifles within 30 days.

Failure to do so will mean they are unlawfully in possession of a prohibited firearm, and subject to as much as 10 years behind bars. It doesn't matter if they purchased it legally, paid all the sales taxes, and have stored it safely ever since.

The RCMP has declared that it was a mistake to allow citizens to purchase these firearms, and wants them turned in, pronto.

Or else.

No apology for the error. No mention of monetary compensation. No exemptions made for people who already owned them. Just an order to hand them over or become a criminal.

When a private citizen tries to do what the RCMP is doing, it's called theft.

The RCMP's seizure of these (up-til-now) legally owned guns will be accomplished with the full weight of the state.

With the G22 rifle, the RCMP has at least a flimsy excuse for the reclassification— it says because the rifle can be easily shortened by removing the back end, it's too easily concealable to be a non-restricted rifle (the blame still lies with the government for making the mistake in the first place, but at least that's something).

The decision to ban the AP-80, however, has no logic behind it at all. The RCMP claims that it was "*incorrectly registered*" as non-restricted because the AP-80 is a "*variant of the design of the firearm commonly known as the AK-47 rifle*" — a Soviet-designed military combat rifle.

Except ... it isn't. At all.

The AP-80 fires an entirely different (and much weaker) kind of ammunition, using a different internal mechanism and is built from completely different materials and components (precisely zero of the parts of the AP-80 and AK-47 are compatible or interchangeable).

The only thing the AP-80 has in common with the AK-47 is its silhouette — when the AP-80 was designed, the manufacturer decided to make it look like the famous AK-47, for purely marketing reasons.

As a rifle, the AP-80 is a completely unremarkable low-caliber plinker. Only by making it look like a famous military rifle could the company hope to sell many copies, so that's what they did. The RCMP is banning the AP-80 because it looks scary.

Many Canadian firearms owners suspect that the federal Tories, once they scrap the long-gun registry, will lose interest in the firearms issue. They'll have kept their promise but, fearful of being painted by the media and opposition as pro-gun extremists, will move on.

But even once the registry is gone, Canada's firearms laws will still be a mess — for proof of that, look no further than the above. Stepping in now to prevent this outrageous seizure of private property on the flimsiest of justifications would be a good place for the Tories to start showing Canada's lawful firearms owners that the Conservative party hasn't forgotten them just yet.

Matt Gurney, **National Post**
mgurney@nationalpost.com

Police Misconduct

Merritt Staff Sergeant Stuart Seib: Reason #9 to Dump the BC RCMP
by Christopher di Armani

Merritt, British Columbia, has the distinction of being the latest RCMP detachment run by an *alleged* criminal and also, it would appear, cocaine addict.

Staff Sergeant Stuart Seib was arrested on Tuesday and charged with stealing cocaine from the RCMP lockup after he was relieved of command of the Merritt RCMP Detachment.

RCMP Southeast District Commander Superintendant Mike Sekela announced at a news conference held in Chilliwack, BC that additional charges are also in the works for Staff Sergeant Stuart Seib.

The latest in a long line of high-profile screwups by RCMP members, Staff Sgt Seib is one of the highest ranking RCMP members to face criminal charges.

News reports have said that Seib disclosed his theft and use of cocaine to another RCMP member, and to that other RCMP member's credit, he or she did NOT try and cover it up or ignore that it happened. Instead the RCMP member appears to have taken new RCMP Commissioner Robert Paulson's recent comments to the press seriously, and reported the incident.

It is very gratifying to see that instead of the usual antics, the RCMP seems very willing to get out in front of this latest fiasco and do everything right. Well, almost everything, anyway. I'll get to what they should have done momentarily... but first, here's what they've done the way the public expects:

First, they immediately relieved Staff Sergeant Seib of duty and revoked his access to RCMP facilities. They charged him with one criminal offense, and have more charges coming down the pipe after their investigation is completed.

Lastly, and this is the most important thing they did, for a change, and that is to recommend that he immediately be placed on suspension WITHOUT PAY, a process that will to be finalized by Friday.

"*The process is underway to proceed with a recommendation that the member be suspended without pay.*"

This is a marked change from the usual standard of suspending rogue cops with pay that has accompanied so many past RCMP misconduct cases and angered more than a few Canadian citizens.

That's a very good thing, and sends the message that RCMP Commissioner Paulson actually has the moral authority inside the RCMP to make his mission resonate with the rank and file.

While I haven't seen a public statement from Commissioner Paulson on this case yet, I'm sure we'll be seeing one shortly, of for no other reason than to emphasize the point that the RCMP is not going to tolerate this crap under his leadership.

The investigation into the missing drugs began on Friday, January 6th, 2012, and had a team of investigators working over the weekend to get to the bottom of things.

To reassure the public Superintendent Sekela said,

"*While the alleged actions of this member are extremely troubling, they are clearly not representative of the high moral and ethical standards of the vast majority of members of the RCMP.*"

I have no doubt this is true.

What is sad is that Superintendant Mike Sekela needs to remind us of the fact that the majority of RCMP members are good cops. We've become so accustomed to scandal and heinous actions by RCMP members here in British Columbia that we NEED that reminder.

Otherwise it's too easy to think that all RCMP members are lying, thieving drug addicts, or worse.

The task now before the RCMP is to determine how far back Sieb's drug thefts and drug use actually go. A recent transfer to the Merritt RCMP detachment, prior to that Sieb was stationed in Clearwater, British Columbia where, among other ironies, he claimed that drug enforcement was his priority.

I guess! How else do you get a free supply of drugs, unless you're stealing it from drug dealers?

My snotty attitude aside, I am very grateful that the RCMP seems to finally be handing a case of RCMP misconduct properly.

On January 5th **I wrote an article** in which I said this about Commissioner Paulson's intentions:

Talk is cheap. Now it's time to DO all the right things and rid the RCMP of its thugs, rapists and thieves, and in so doing bring back some integrity and honour to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

It appears, at least on the surface, that Commissioner Paulson is a man of his word.

It's about time we had one of those heading up the RCMP.

Ridiculous Story of the Week

Sober 82-year-old fined for drunk driving in B.C. after she couldn't blow hard enough to give a breath sample

By Ian Mulgrew, National Post

An 82-year-old Cranbrook, B.C. woman with medical problems says she was made to stand in the midnight chill for more than two hours while RCMP officers attempted 15 times to obtain a breath sample.

When the stone-cold-sober pensioner with poor lung capacity was unable to blow hard enough to activate the roadside screening device, Margaret MacDonald was cited for failing to blow, her licence was suspended, she was fined $500 and her car was towed.

She quickly went to the local hospital where she had her blood tested for alcohol and obtained a medical certificate that said there was none in her system.

"*I know if you don't have proof, no one will believe you*," Ms. MacDonald explained.

"*That's what possessed me to go to the hospital. The Mounties weren't going to get away with saying I was drunk or had been drinking.*"

When she complained to the detachment, a corporal tried to help her out and gave her a letter supporting her appeal.

It didn't matter a whit — the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles adjudicator still found her guilty under the province's controversial drunk-driving laws.

"*I may only have six months, maybe a year; when you're in your 80s you don't know how long you have left*," Ms. MacDonald said Tuesday.

"*Why should I have to spend my days fighting this? I'm on a fixed income and it's already cost me $6,000. I consider this whole matter to constitute a substantial wrong and a miscarriage of justice that could have been avoided if the officers involved had not jumped to the conclusion that I was impaired, had not completely ignored me, had discussed anything with me and had given me a chance to explain anything. Not one of them even asked if I had had a drink.*"

The RCMP haven't resolved her complaint — she'd like to be reimbursed by the force for her out-of-pocket expenses — and she is seeking a judicial review of the adjudicator's decision.

On May 21, Ms. MacDonald visited a friend in Jaffray, about 50 km southeast of the city.

During dinner to celebrate an engagement, she says she had a sip of champagne in a token toast about 6 o'clock.

A Mountie doing a routine traffic check on Highway 3 stopped her on her way home around 11:45 p.m. He stuck his head in the driver's side window, chatted with her and told her to beware of elk.

About 45 minutes later, in Cranbrook, a few blocks from her house, Ms. MacDonald mistakenly turned into the wrong lane and drove around a median. She felt dumb, but got home and parked her car.

She was at her front door when a car pulled up and the driver beckoned to her. She thought the woman was lost.

After pointing out her bad driving, the woman told Ms. MacDonald she was an off-duty cop and a patrol car was on the way to give her a breathalyzer test. She left when the cruiser arrived.

The responding RCMP officer and auxiliary asked Ms. MacDonald to blow into the roadside screening device.

She was unable to generate sufficient breath but they kept trying, and trying, and trying — 15 times,

according to the material filed with the adjudicator.

"*One would have thought they might have considered that due to health and age I was unable to complete the test*," Ms. MacDonald said.

"*At the age of 82, I have developed various health problems. Five years ago, I had pneumonia and was told by my doctor that I have scarring on one of my lungs; I have from time to time mild to mildly severe lung congestion*."

The Mounties kept her standing outside wearing only a pair of sandals, a cotton skirt and a light blouse on a night that Environment Canada says the temperature hovered about 11 C.

She said she had to "beg" to go to the bathroom.

She began to become more stressed, upset and cold as their efforts continued:

"*It took me two days to warm up afterwards*."

Ms. MacDonald estimated she was forced to stand for nearly an hour in the middle of the cul-de-sac in the glare of the cruiser's headlights, her neighbours watching from their windows.

"*This was very embarrassing*," she added. "*I was traumatized due to the treatment from the RCMP*."

When they realized she wasn't able to give a breath sample, the junior Mounties called a superior. Ms. MacDonald thought it took him about half an hour to arrive.

On leaving his car, she maintained he roughly grabbed the roadside screening unit, inserted it in her mouth and sharply ordered her to blow.

"*I could not blow at all*," she said. "I was traumatized, cold and close to tears. When I could not blow, the senior RCMP banged his fist on the squad car and shouted at me: 'Blow, blow ... Your tongue is in the tube. You are doing this on purpose. You are slurring your words. You are drunk. I can smell alcohol on you.' I said, 'I don't drink.' He barked: 'They all say that!'"

She was cited for failing to provide a breath sample, given a Notice of Driving Prohibition for three months, told to pay a $500 fine and informed her car would be immediately towed.

"I was crying," Ms. MacDonald recalled. "I was humiliated. I cleaned out my car and a tow truck took it away. By this time it was about 2:45 a.m. I was exhausted, freezing cold and still crying."

Too upset to sleep, Ms. MacDonald decided if the RCMP were going to claim she smelled of booze, she wasn't going to take it.

"I would get a blood test," she concluded. "I took a cab to the Cranbrook hospital where I was given a blood-alcohol test at about 3:50 a.m. The test showed there was zero-per-cent alcohol in my blood."

It was a long weekend, so on the Tuesday morning she went to the RCMP detachment and complained.

After a cursory investigation, the corporal provided her with a letter saying: "I believe it is only fair that this Driving Prohibition and Vehicle Impound be terminated and removed from your driving record as soon as possible to mitigate any further impact to yourself."

He could not rescind the immediate roadside prohibition but helped her file an appeal.

That cost Ms. MacDonald another $200.

"I don't usually drink — the last time I had anything to drink was a half glass of wine at Easter dinner in April," Ms. MacDonald confided.

"I was treated as guilty of driving while impaired without anyone even asking me if I had had a drink ... I have had a motor vehicle licence for 63 years without any other incident. Nothing like this has ever happened to me. I was standing in the cold, lungs congested, legs hurting and dry mouth. They did not care."

The oral hearing was held June 1 and her appeal was denied June 9.

A few days later, Ms. MacDonald suffered a mild, stress-related heart attack and was in hospital for five days.

Her attempt to seek redress in B.C. Supreme Court was put on hold late last year because the drunk-driving provisions were already under review.

On Dec. 23, Justice Jon Sigurdson gave the province until June 30 to correct flaws in the drunk-driving legislation because parts were unconstitutional — but only insofar as they applied to those who blow a "fail" on the roadside device, which indicates a blood-alcohol level of over .08.

The police have the power to be both judge and jury at the side of the road, but when they screw up royally like they did here, suddenly they're are powerless to *correct* their screwup???

Ain't Canada great?