

Page 2 - Speech (Draft) Sept. 30, 1981

which was merely passed by the political centralized party at the top, and then enforced on the people below. Our Constitution has followed the Russian procedure.

During the last election our present Prime Minister, Pierre Trudeau, completely concealed from the electors his planned and already drafted Constitution. He did not reveal its terms or contents until he was safely back in power. He

not only ignored the democratic tradition of allowing the voter, ^{A CHOICE ON IMPORTANT CHANCES} he denied the traditional ^{ALSO} custom ^{DEMOCRATIC} of allowing the people's elected opposition to freely debate it in parliament. He completely silenced that by evoking closure of parliament with armed guards present. He then whisked his Constitution out behind the closed doors of a parliamentary committee and then the Supreme Court, both of which's majority ^{MEMBER} were politically appointed by him, and from which the public only got in ^{TO SPEAK BY} invitation.

Fortunately the Indian people, at their own expense, journeyed to Ottawa where they were met with barbed wire barricades but their quiet persistence forced their brief to be heard. Persons like myself who wished to speak on the rights of individual property rights were merely allowed to submit briefs never heard by the committee or the public. Trudeau ^{NOW} ~~then~~ hopes to have our Constitution proclaimed law in another country - England. ^{NOT IN OUR PARLIAMENT}

Page 3 - Draft Speech

Neither its passage nor the contents of this proposed Constitution conform with our centuries of carefully built up common law and tradition that has preserved our and England's great and beloved democracy.

This Constitution ~~itself~~ ^{is} ~~was~~ completely undemocratic. Property rights, sacred to the individual, are what distinguish a democracy from a communist state. Trudeau, in this Constitution, removed the individual's, ~~the~~ companies' and the provinces' property rights. He did this by omission. Diefenbaker's ~~ss~~ Bill of Rights passed twenty-two years ago guaranteed us the enjoyment of our property rights. Trudeau copied Diefenbaker's Bill ^{IN HIS CHARTER} right up until he got to the vital phrase that guaranteed property rights and then he simply omitted them from your present Constitution. By a trick section which ^{FOR DISGUISED PURPOSES} he ^{HAS} renumbered four times - section now presently 58, he declared the Constitution is "the Supreme Law of Canada" ^{ANY} and any law inconsistent with it is no longer of force or effect.

Since property rights were omitted, ^{FROM THE CONSTITUTION} they are inconsistent, therefore, all our past common law and statutes that honoured our possession ^{IN COURT} of ^{IN COURT} property are no longer of "any force or effect." Having put in the Constitution a means of depriving us of our property rights, he also put in the Constitution a section which ^{ON THE GROUND THE WERE} allowed the Federal Government to take over our property "to promote ^{NC} opportunities for Canada, or to promote or to further economic development, to reduce disparities and opportunities".

Page 4 - Draft Speech Sept. 30, 1981

This means, I believe, ^{THAT} Ottawa has the power to decide what is ^{AN} opportunity and take any action they want ^{THEN} to promote them. And since we have no protection for our property rights left, that could include the taking of individual's, companies' or provincial properties. The whole Constitution is full of phrases regarding bilingual jobs, imprisonment, where the discretionary choice is now left wide open for Ottawa to legislate on, and the individual is robbed of ^{ANY} defence. ^{IN COURT. THAT WILL STAND UP.} In my opinion, it is a totally undemocratic Constitution, which will bring about violent changes in our present Canadian way of life.

Canadians for so long have enjoyed the democratic rights they inherited from England, rights they have never had to defend in a revolution or a civil war, or even in a war within their own boundaries. ^{WE} ~~They~~ were totally unprepared for this attack on ~~their~~ ^{OUR} democratic rights from within, indeed, from within ~~their~~ ^{OUR} own government.

As a result Canadians have been plunged into a year-and-a-half of fear, anger and confusion, as they gradually discovered how very little their elected Government cared for their financial survival, their beloved democratic rights, or the future of Canadian children.

Fortunately Canada's long respect for ~~our~~ law was justified when the Supreme Court on Monday the 28th day of September, 1981, handed down their fine and judicial judgment in answer to the questions placed before it by the provinces as to whether the BNA Act could be unilaterally amended by replacing it with this

Constitution and Charter of Rights without the consent of the Provinces.

The Court did a great service to Canada. Loyal to their judicial and legal training many of them ^{IGNORED} ~~crossed~~ their past political affiliations and with a firm and respected voice told the people of Canada about ^{their} ~~the~~ present position as to unilateral repatriation without the provinces' consent.

Space left here for Court Findings:

Page 6 Draft Speech

Left blank for Court Findings

00x00nxtixxi0na1x00nnntxi0nx0nx0uxxpxrakiianntxn0frnn0xxf0kx
ixxwxgixttnxxxi0stnnnnxann0xfm0zi0nnx

The very existence of ^{THE CANADIAN} parliament itself is dependent only on Constitutional Convention. For instance Trudeau was taking complete advantage of our Canadian Constitutional Convention when he demanded Joe Clark step down as Prime Minister because ~~the budget~~. he had lost a vote on ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ (budget) There is no ^{A MONEY BILL - A} legal right or written law to that effect. Furthermore Trudeau took advantage of our Canadian Constitutional Conventions by assuming leadership of the government when he was elected by a majority. Again there is no legal provision for this in Canada, it is all ^{DONE} ^{CONSTITUTIONAL} only by convention.

Now, however, when ^{TRUDEAU} he wants his own way ^{AND DESIRES} and to centralize all power in his own government he has begun to say "all that counts is the legal right. The Constitutional Convention I have used up to now since it presently no longer serves my own purposes ^{IT} should ^{NOW} be ignored." That is why he is trying to stress now that he has the legal right, ^{A RIGHT HE HAS ONLY BECAUSE} there is no law that prevents him and ^{HE IS STATING HE CAN} to ignore the ^{VERY} fact ~~XX~~ ^{THAT} that the Court's decision stressed he was acting without the necessary Constitutional Convention that has been the past governing law in a great many government matters, ^{IF HE FORCES} ~~UNIVERSAL~~ ^{UNILATERAL} PASSAGE OF HIS CONSTITUTIONARY CHARTER OF RIGHT IT WILL BE BECAUSE HE CHOSE THE PART OF ^{DOES} ~~IF~~ he chooses to merely use a legal loophole, ignoring the moral ^{THEIR ORDER THAT PLEASED HIM AND IGNORED THE REST. THE RES ARE} and traditional principals of the Canadians' way of life, he ^{UNFORTUNATELY} ~~POSSIBLY~~ ^{MAY} ~~could~~ pass this Constitution with mere political clout, and send it to England.

Fortunately Lord Kershaw, who headed the Committee appointed by the English Government to advise them on the legality and correctness of Canada's request to pass this Constitution and Charter of Rights, ^{HAS WRITTEN A} ~~in his~~ massive ~~written~~ ^{IN WHICH HE} report reached in principal the same findings as our Supreme Court of Canada. So England should be heavily influenced and refuse to pass the Constitution and the Charter of Rights without the provinces' consent.

Page 9 - Draft Speech

I, with the assistance of many others, mailed over 2,000 letters to the Members of the Commons and the House of Lords and its various committees. The replies were many and courteous and there are a small group ^{OF ENGLISH MEMBERS & LORDS} already opposed to its passage. However, it was clear ^{TO ME} that Mrs. Thatcher is most anxious to retain the friendship of her Canadian allyx(allie). She feels that Trudeau, ~~as~~ as our elected representative, represents the desires of the majority of the Canadian people.

Trudeau was only elected to power on the strength of two promises he made to Quebec and Ontario - neither of which he could keep, or has kept. At the time of that election, the Constitution was not mentioned and ~~since it was introduced the~~ ^{for} people of Canada support ~~Trudeau~~ ^{Trudeau} has undergone a radical change. Because the Constitution followed the election, the people have been limited in a manner in which they can express their disapproval but despite that, the facts are startling. In Quebec, where an election was held, Mr. Trudeau's opponent, Premier Levesque, won an overwhelming victory. And now Trudeau's supporter in Quebec, Cluade Ryan, has stated his opposition to the Trudeau Government Constitution. It is evident, Quebec, may if necessary, separate. ^{Liberal} Two byelections were held in the safest/ridings in Quebec and Ontario and the Trudeau Liberals were both soundly defeated. The Gallop Polls (which ~~are~~ ^{are} the only way the public's opinion can be measured) show a steadily rising opposition to Trudeau and are now sixty-nine percent against. ^{TRUDEAU'S METHODS & CONSTITUTION}

¹⁰ And Western Canada new political parties are being formed who are advocating separation from Canada if the Constitution is passed. Most dramatic, however, has been the attitude of 8 out of 10 ~~(XXXXXX)~~ Premiers. It began with four Premiers resistance and is now up to eight, to whom the Constitution is unacceptable in its present form. But unfortunately England is probably unaware that ^{OF THESE} ~~such~~ is the change in attitude of Canadians.

And there is a possibility, although now following the Supreme Court's ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ decision in favour of the Provinces, that England ^{(despite these facts, CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES} would still pass the Constitution, believing they are ^{IN GOOD FAITH} ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ responding to the

request of the majority of the Canadian people. If that happens, ^{IN MY BELIEF} Canada will ~~XXXXXX~~ cease to be a democracy and a federal nation as it was, ^{CLORIOUS} ~~will pass. IN OUR PAST IN MY BELIEF~~

Our present only defense as Concerned Canadians has to take the ^{AGAINST HAVING THIS CONSTITUTION FORCED ON U} ~~XXXXXX~~ form of writing letters to England, writing letters to dissenting assure the eight/Premiers we will support them in their resistance and by creating public understanding and more resistance to this Constitutional package.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

PUBLIC VOICED OPPOSITION

~~This~~ latter is absolutely necessary. Canadians must realize that Western Canadians who had already, in effect, lost their power to appoint a government by their shortage of numbers, will now, if the consent of the Premiers is not required, lose the only regional representation form of government they ever had.

Unfortunately we Canadians, unlike the Americans, have no elected Senate to protect our regional interests. All we ever had was the required approval of the Premiers. If this is lost, Canada

will turn into a highly centralized totalitarian state that will serve only the party in power. We will also be governed as our

Supreme Law by a Constitution and a Charter of Rights, ^{ONE} that

deprives us of ^{EVEN} our most basic rights - ~~chief of which~~ is - the right as individuals to own property. NO CHECKS OR CONTROL

The Canadian public must become concerned vitally with their politics, or they will lose what they or their parents came here to gain and which young men have died for in two ^{Wars} ~~years~~ - a Convention of Democracy.

You may lose this even if Trudeau does not have his way and the Constitution fails to pass. Trudeau is a fanatically determined, self-willed man. He warned us long ago that there was "another way" besides the Constitution. Many of you are totally unaware that he has already put his "other ways" into operation. It began with his subtle attacks on the energy industry, the newspapers and our Mounties. By appointing his own Committees who produced unfavourable reports on all these branches, he is already preparing the

Page 12 - Draft Speech - Sept. 30, 1981

legislation to eliminate ^{AND CONTROL} ~~these~~ ^{THREE} VITAL AREAS EFFECTIVENESS
BUT HE HAS ^{EVEN} GONE FURTHER. —

If ~~this~~ Constitution fails he has already passed on June the 10^{LAST}th
of this year an Order-In-Council which can deprive any of us of
our property rights, send us without right of appeal to
established civilian internment camps and seize our property
without any adequate compensation. This is by Order-In-Council
No. _____

An Order-In-Council is passed by the Cabinet ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ - meeting
behind closed doors, and once signed by the Governor-General
(which this one has been), becomes enforceable law. This Order-
In-Council has the innocent title of "Emergency Planning". By
it powers are given to Cabinet Ministers and their unelected
deputies and ^{EVEN} to the heads of Crown Corporations. The Act itself
at first seems innocent enough, except one would wonder WHY it
is passed at this time, and WHY no publicity was given to its
passage.