

I
Mr Mathewson I'm afraid
there is some sort of misun-
derstanding re my ~~of~~ Edmonton
speech.

I presumed since ~~he~~ ^{Mr al Upstad} phoned
after I made the Calgary
speech he & Mr Karuleson knew
I would be making the
same speech in Edmonton.
I made in Calgary.

That's the only kind of
speech I am prepared to
make. I spoke on why the
new constitution was not
acceptable. - ~~because~~ * I
only choose one specialized
section of its legal rights
properly rights.

Now Mr Upstad wants
to bill me as a civil rights
authority. I'm not - I'm not
~~even~~ speaking on civil
rights. It makes me an AI

fool to be ~~speaking~~ speaking
on property a legal right
when I'm billed for civilian
rights.

~~The~~

I think I must insist
that is all I'm speaking on.

He has a past member of
the social credit party, ~~you can~~
didn't catch the name. ~~He~~
has - says his speaking on
constitutional rights & when
I said what part ^{of the constitution} he said
well on the Statute of
Westminster, - Well that's
not my idea of constitutional
law.

I feel all the discussion
of ~~what~~ how we can
obtain sovereignty can only
come after people are ready
to separate. It's like
talking about ~~what~~ ^{how} manner
you will paint a car before

of paint you will put on
a car before you've bought the
car.

I'm really not too anxious
to speak at all but if I do
I give only the speech. I gave
in Calgary & take no part
in being questioned on the
matter of sovereignty. ^{It} may be
new & surprising to Mr
Caulson but it's really been
here quite a time. Mr Seveque
been talking it for years
It of course requires a
referendum & you see what
happened to Quebec? Just
because we have the right
doesn't mean any people
have to use that right

You need a majority who
choose that right because they decide
they want a Western Canada
of any kind ~~before you~~
~~decide to them what~~
~~kind. + I can't be so if I~~
~~do speak I will speak~~
~~first (not last as I said~~
~~to Mr Upjohn because then~~
~~I thought we would~~

I do not wish to ~~debate~~
to the ~~provincial~~ people the
provincial government the

not only that since some
one whose name is called as
a constitutional expert
blame the bill with
me

you've bought the car.

I feel its premature anyway
nothing new - I feel Mr Levesque
been defining sovereignty for
years - it of course can never
come without a referendum.
& even in Quebec that was
defeated. So I think the
question of sovereignty is
premature. The true consideration
for the Westener is ~~can~~ "if
the new constitution is passed
what will he do then ~~pull~~
~~out~~ ⁽¹⁾ just comply or ⁽²⁾ pull out
& form a western Canada.

I will just have to state
since all the speakers but
me will be speaking on the
great importance constitutionally
of the Westmenster Act. That
frankly my only concern is
with the constitution.

If it comes will we then have
good reasons new reasons

for forming an ~~Atlantic~~ Canadian
West." I ~~frankly~~ don't

I like the idea of West-
Fed being a non political
organization in contrast to
the other separatists groups &
for that reason will be glad
to speak on their behalf but
only on the defects & the
impossibility of remaining
a true Canadian if the charter
is passed & how that ~~forces~~ ^{combined by}
~~now to~~ the rape of our ~~own~~
natural resources forces us
to feel we must be prepared
to see how could we if necessary
preserve it in the west or
at least form a society to
study the Western Provinces
needs.

My views may not go
as far as yours. I won't only
to move one space at a time
just let's get rid of the charter
secondly let's see how we can
~~retain increase~~ ~~can~~

somehow assure that never
again can the federal govt.