

## Police's new naming and shaming is 'ugly, lifealtering practice,' says reader

After reading your editorial and hearing about this issue in other news this past week, I welcome the chance to respond. While I am not a lawyer, I certainly have dealt with law enforcement officials enough over the years to know the law is not always applied equally and fairly to all. Thankfully we have the courts to sort out what is fair and correct. Most experts that I have heard weigh in on this particular subject don't seem to think it will stand a constitutional challenge. (I wonder who foots the bill for that exercise...).

That being said, since when do the police get to decide these policies? They are not elected by the people. Making off the cuff remarks as justification for this change such as they have about incidences not declining enough to suit is irresponsible. The laws have changed to lower limits and enforcement practices have undergone cost cutting that result in 'blitzes' now instead of regular officers on duty doing the enforcement. Could this have any effect on their stats?

To add to the mix, someone (don't know where this one came from!) has decided officers can now do away with their reasonable suspicion requirement and are now planning to make every stopped driver take the test. 1984 is not far off!

If elected officials decide on policy changes that help the community (and they are lawful) I would hope they at least insist on the person being convicted before this ugly, life altering practice begins.

I am not in favour of anyone driving impaired... or distracted... or while putting on makeup... or while arguing or any number of other accident causing preventable situations but we don't shame those people, nor should we.

I guess they don't have groups for victims of those people who can successfully lobby our police.

P. Service  
Aurora