

I

As a ^{if not a voter} Taxpayer for over 40 years in Mr Taylors constituency I am shocked that he would now defend an undemocratic constitution that robs individuals of their past guaranteed to their own property rights.

The letter he sent out ^{to} is full of false statements regarding our present ^{individual} property rights under the new constitution he suddenly supports.

He tells you, you are protected because the past BNA act is incorporated in the new constitution ^{thus, but he fails to tell you} ~~the BNA~~ ^{Nowhere in that act is the} the individuals ^{to property} guarantee rights even mentioned. Read it and see. He quotes section 92 (13) that gives the provinces jurisdiction over land ^{on land} property in the provinces. He failed to tell you that by section 91 (1A) ^{of the BNA act -} the federal government has jurisdiction over ^{each} ~~all~~ Canadians property rights & by that section they have now asserted that right & taken away the past individuals guaranteed right to his own property.

He tells you section 52 (2) in the constitution but doesn't tell you what section 52 the governing ^{of this subsection 2} says. "The constitution is the supreme law of Canada". In Canada we get our ^{now} ^{property guarantee} rights by common laws established since Magna Carta in the

man that now with the present inaccurate statements that were just sent him by eastern politicians.

Fortunately Canadians are primarily believers in democratic rights & ^{that democratic rights} ~~they are~~ totally dependant on the right of the individual to own & keep secure what he has earned by the "sweat of his brow"

Note what has happened. Since in secret & by clause 4 with the VOB's help, ^{the Liberal} Trudeau has forced the constitution on all Canadians who were denied even the right to vote on it because it was concealed during the last federal election campaign - Canadians have ^{still secret} repelled by vote in the polls this constitution since that time.

In 3 by-elections - one in Ontario, one in Quebec, one in Ontario the supporters of the constitution were defeated. In the provincial by-election the premier who said I will not sign & don't, Levesque was elected ^{provincial premier} ~~for~~ Steinhilber and ~~the~~ Blakney ^{the constitution} who signed & were hurled out by the electors. Neither Peter Lougheed nor

courts & by our ^{past} provincial & federal statute laws. This section carefully states this is the "supreme law" meaning ^{clearly} it overrules ^{every} ~~except~~ all common law ^{court} decisions, & all past statute laws. This section clearly states that any law that is inconsistent with the constitution is of "no force or effect".

Our past ~~rights~~ ^{now} guarantee as individuals to properly rights were in the other "any laws" ^{now} ~~because~~ the constitution carefully & with purpose omitted the ^{individuals} guarantee given ^{we individuals} to us in our past amendable federal bill of rights passed by

Diefenbaker to protect us 17 years ago ~~those rights~~ ^{now} ~~that~~ ^{they} ~~those~~ ^{now} ~~guarantees~~ ^{are} ~~are~~ ^{now} ~~inconsistent~~ & of "no force or effect". You have them but you can't "enforce them". If ^{the provincial or federal} ~~they~~ government take your property you can't "enforce" your past guaranteed right & stop them. The right of enforcing it is now theirs.

~~The~~ politician Taylor tells you of sub-section (2) of 52 but omits to tell you of ^{what} ~~the~~ ⁵² ~~section~~ ^{actually} ~~itself~~ says.

Under the BNA act the Feds can pass laws ^{on} property rights they now have & they just deleted ^{the} individual guarantees that protected

As you will find. If all the people in the
4 western provinces, all the people in
the two North West Territories, all the
people in the 3 maritime provinces & all
the people

Newfoundland were desperate to
stop more take over by government, or
the present take over under the
constitution, their vote is not 50%
of the population. They can not amend

No removal of ^{the} bad clauses ^{in the constitution} nor
prevention of further ^{even worse} by constitutional
law ^{against} of individual rights can be
stopped except by the vote of Ontario
or Quebec. We are completely at their
mercy for any assistance or protection.

By the present constitution the
federal government now legally can
rob the west to buy ^{just} Ontario & Quebec
support in any election in the future
& it is legal law.

We in Alberta as a province can't
amend. We have even surrendered any
past rights we once had through
provincial conferences to amend.

Fundamental only has to call them but
is now not governed by their decision

Mr Taylor in the past has a fine
record as a politician. He should not

him from any government either provincial
or Federal from taking ~~ours~~ ^{from} ^{our house} our individual
rights to our car, our land, our company away.

I am also shocked that Mr Taylor also
tries to assure his constituents they have
now a right to amend the constitution.

No American ever do that, He tells
~~you the elected federal government can~~
~~am~~ He speaks of the provinces right to
amend & the federally elected government
right. He omitted to tell you it can't
be amended unless the Federally ^{also} controlled
senate also pass it. He also omitted to
point out no western province can amend
it. After the Ontario & Quebec elected
federal government have agreed to
amend the constitution & the totally
& life appointed liberal senators have
voted to amend it. then & then only
can the provinces be consulted.

If Ottawa has agreed to an amendment
all the provinces could do is agree
too. For the provinces to stop ^{an amendment} ^{border} ^{against} ^{been like} it
it requires 7 provinces with 50%
of the ^{Canadian} population. If you take the
last census figures & add them up

