

1
draft
answer to
Feb 24

The by-election victory of the first
all Western Candidate in Alberta has
made Eastern Canadians realize
something besides wheat and oil
lies ~~beyond the~~ in the vast area
~~beyond the great~~ west of the
Great lakes. That something is
people. ~~People~~ Independent people
who are now visibly enraged ^{increase}
concerning ~~central Canada~~ ^{extension by} the federal
government of oppressive control. People
who are now refusing to be ^{simply} governed
by a constitution that deprives them
of what they regard as their
~~powerless~~ ^{then then} right to own property.

The by-election also has at least
 flushed out a statement from the
 prime ministers office regarding
 property rights. It's the first of
 its kind, and they ^{now} state Canadian
 property rights get ample protection
 from section 26.
 protection ^{for} under section 26:
 for their property rights.
 despite this ^{deliberate} omission ^{of property} from the
 new charter ^{which is in the constitution} which is part + parcel
 of the constitution. He claims
 are ~~reg~~ past rights are protected
 under section 26. That statement
 has as much validity as his pre-
 election promise to Ontario that
 they would get gas 17 cents a
 gallon cheaper if he were elected.

The constitution was passed without
concealed during that ^{last} election
campaign & so was passed without
a single Canadian.

waters and in the Globe & Mail the
 liberal government prime ministers office tells
 them they ^{at last} ~~admits~~ ^{in interview} ~~to~~ ^{not} ~~admit~~
 the omission
 of properly rights from the constitution
 but reassures an angry west that rights
 are ~~are~~ ^{are} ably protected by section 26.
 C. ~~But~~

Broadbent ~~but~~ ^{now} is hunched up
 is wisely ~~keeping~~ ^{keeping} very quiet
 about the ~~constitution~~ ^{constitution} + ~~huddled~~ ^{thunked}
 up in a dark corner he is ~~hoping~~ ^{issuing no statements}
 the public will ^{just} forget it was his
 NDP party vote that enabled
 the liberals with their small
 majority ~~vote~~ ^{what came} ~~from~~ ^{entirely} ~~central~~ ^{central} Canada,
 that forced the ~~constitution~~ ^{entrenched undemocratic} on
 Canadians.

being allowed to vote on it, in fact ~~most~~
~~most~~ most have not yet seen it. We
 were treated, at our own expense, to TV
 ads showing symbolically a single Canadian
 goose flying ^{across} ~~over~~ a sunset and pictures
 of Trudeau dancing with an arab, but
 the average citizen never had explained
 to him what his new entrenched
 laws would ^{actually} be,

Now when for all practical purposes
 the Constitution has been ^{supreme} ~~passed~~ ^{become the law of Canada}, and
 following ^{the consultation} ~~its introduction~~ the introduction of this concealed
~~after~~ 3 unsuccessful by-elections, one
 in Quebec, one in Ontario & now one
 in Western Canada, the Liberals have
^{even} ~~seriously~~ decided to ~~throw out~~ on troubled

party were defeated in ^{by-election} ~~Ontario~~

Ontario + Quebec + in Alberta
a ^{Western} party that ^{amongst pro Western platform} said if necessary

they were prepared to separate
from Canada rather than ^{governed by} ~~had~~ such a ^{absolute} constitution.
~~from Canada~~. This later has prompted

the Prime minister ^{offer} to finally
issue a statement on property
rights to calm troubled waters.

We were told in the press ~~th-on~~
~~Feb~~ for the first time on February 23^d
that ~~the refer~~ that our right to
own property is guaranteed by
section 26.

Section 26 is one of the last
minute additions to the
constitution before it went to
London

It was ^{unfortunately} signed by the ^{very} same promoters
who Sudean had labeled the gang
of light with Loveque wisely withholding
his signature ~~saying it was necessary~~ ^{to have him}
~~to read the small print.~~

London & it says -

~~Note there is no guarantee as to past properly rights you are only reassured their existence will not be denied~~

Properly rights are omitted from the charter ^{therefore} would ^{qualify as} be one of the "any other rights or freedoms". That ~~that~~ that existed before the constitution

The guarantee is not that they can be enforced it is simply their existence will not be denied

their existence is recognized. But

are they enforceable. Nothing in

it says so. You look to section

~~24 (1) page 9 called enforced.~~

nor does it say you actually have
 a right it just says its existence
 won't be denied. So you when a
 in a hypothetical case lets pretend
 your property is seized. The only
 way to defend it in Canada is in
 court, you go to court showing title
 & pleading the past laws that
 protected & ^{had} granted ^{you a} that right, to
 property. The judge will recognize
 its existence ^{of that past law & right} but the government ^{can}
^{however it does} will plead section 52 ⁽¹⁾ of the
 constitution, ~~instead~~ The liberals
 never mention this section. It says

on page 18

~~The judge~~ Properly rights which
were deliberately despite the oppositions
pleading removed from the constitution
completely are inconsistent &
the finding will have to be especially
in view of the phrase "The Supreme
law^F of Canada" that although the
court will recognize the existence of
your claim to properly now it
is of NO FORCE OR EFFECT.

You have a right but it is
unenforceable. On the other hand
the government under the
equalization section has an

enforceable right to take property
 read section 36 page 11 where the
 provinces & the federal government
 are both committed ~~for~~ to promoting
 opportunities or fulfilling economic
 development to reduce disparities
 in opportunities. In other words
 they are allowed to take from the
 haves & give to the have nots
 be they individuals or property.

Your left clinging to ~~a few~~
 the ancient rights to property
 you had & are still on the books
 but can be rendered unenforceable
 by the government whenever they
 want against a province or
 an individual.

offered your first ^{top} ~~executives~~ ^{selected} executives of Maguaid & Moreland the advice of an advisory council I would gather from W.C.C. members who had specialized training but ~~rather because~~ of the type of job they had in special fields our party lacked. This advisory board met with leaders Maguaid & Moreland has despite internal ^{power} struggles ^{at the} for power positions functioned with your ~~de~~ ^{acting} acting leaders & president over a 4 month period & put together a legally possible ~~co~~ policy statement & a constitution that would guarantee all decisions whether on separation or money expenditure would originate from the constituency level thus preventing personal opinions to override the party as a whole's desires.

Howard Thompsons convention committee has tried out a policy based on an area's amendments to policy to present at the constitution. I was unable to get the support of Mr. Reeds or Mr. Paul Steen who were the constitutional committee who had volunteered to serve from your board for the new constitution. I ~~sent~~ ^{after months of work had arranged to have} had mailed out to you. Dr. Marshall said he would personally ask it not be discussed now which meant a further controversial debate within the party at the

time.

My constitution provided for a small board elected directly from the areas concerned rather than ^{large unwieldy often appointed} local zone directors. It provided for a special meeting each year of the party on policy which would include the manner or need for separation yearly being decided by constituents elected representatives rather than a board thus reflecting the majority of party members from all over Alberta desired rather than individual board members. It limited spending without ^{voled consent of} supervision provided for a reasonable means of expulsion which was dependant on ~~the~~ the own persons unwillingness to cooperate rather than mere boards disapproval. I felt the way all Albertans would be given a chance to participate rather than mere ^{upper} politicians or directors choosing the decision the party would take.

However it was unfortunately not acceptable by directors Pat Allen, ^{or wife} Enol Squires zone director or Dr Marshall electorate & their announcement to oppose it now has resulted in my decision to postpone its presentation for a vote at the convention as they said. It wouldn't work, would waste too much time. To debate it now would