

OUTLINE: INTRODUCTION: (LOOK OUT ONTARIO)

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF DECEPTION (KEEP TIGHT ITS JUST SCENERY)
2. PRESENT DECEPTION IS IN FORM OF (TIGHT IS THEIR POINT)  
S. 26

3. REPLY TO S. 26

A) SEC. 53 - NULLIFIES S. 26.

B. SEC. 36 - FURTHER INCREASE  
GOVERNMENT RTS. OF INFRINGEMENT

KEY

CONCLUSION: WESTERN PARTY WAS ELECTED  
LOOK OUT ONTARIO.

to continue the <sup>study</sup> preparation of a new  
constitution for the W.C.C. party & that  
at your next general party meeting it  
<sup>must</sup> ~~will~~ <sup>at least</sup> be presented <sup>to the members at large</sup> for your voting delegates  
<sup>careful</sup> consideration & vote.



## Introduction:

We have been living ~~under~~ in  
an ~~era~~ era of deception and the  
most recent is Section 26 (being granted  
"existence" of all rights you had)

However, this section has NO force  
and effect when viewed in context  
of 2 other sections: 53 & 36.

This is why Western Canada  
party had its "surprise" <sup>1</sup> ~~surprise~~  
and this is why Ontario must  
be concerned (Quebec is threatening  
separation again and now Alberta)



As soon as the first all-Western  
political party elected <sup>by an overwhelming majority</sup> ~~their~~ first a  
candidate at a by-election ~~with~~ by  
an ~~overwhelming majority~~, Trudeau  
started  
has been ~~trying~~ to discredit ~~them~~,  
& their ~~attitude towards~~ <sup>STAND ON</sup> individuals' property rights.  
Now that our undemocratic Constitution  
is for all practical purposes an  
accomplish fact, he <sup>now</sup> ~~is~~ has condescended to  
throwing ~~throw~~ out reassuring hints to an  
alarmed public, as to what it  
contains. The Constitution was  
concealed during his election and  
not a single Canadian was allowed  
to cast a vote as to what his  
future "entrenched" laws would



The by-election victory of the first all Western Candidate in Alberta has made Eastern Canadians realize something besides wheat and oil lie in the vast area west of the Great Lakes. That something is people. Independent people who are now visably enraged concerning the extension and increase by the federal government of oppressive control. People who are now refusing to be governed by a constitution that deprives them of what they regard as their right to their own property.

The by-election also has at last flushed out a statement from the Prime Minister's office regarding property rights. They now state despite the deliberate ommission of property rights from the new charter which is in the Constitution, Canadians get ample protection from 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 concealed during the last election campaign and so was passed without a single Canadian being allowed to vote on it. In fact, most have not yet seen it. We were treated, at our own expense, to TV ads showing symbolically a single Canadian Goose flying across 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.



~~The Western paper~~

The new western parties wisely  
fear being governed by such  
a constitution or a ~~loose~~ ~~loose~~  
the guarantee of their



Now when for all practical purposes the Constitution has become the Supreme Law of Canada and since the surprise appearance of the Constitution, the Liberals have had three unsuccessful by-elections - one in Quebec, one in Ontario and now one in Western Canada. Now the Liberals have decided to calm seriously troubled waters. They admit, for the first time, the omission of property rights from the Constitution on February 23rd to the press but reassure an angry West past property rights are already protected by Section 26 and claim the Western Party's fear of the loss of property rights is totally unfounded and, therefore, their political success can be ignored.

3/

So in a hypothetical case let's pretend your property is seized. The only way to defend it in Canada is in court. You go to court showing title and pleading the past laws that protected and had granted you a right to property. The judge will recognize the existence of those past laws and rights but the government can whenever it desires plead Section 52(1) of the Constitution.

The Liberals never mention this Section. It says on page 18 "The Constitution of Canada is the supreme law of Canada, and any law that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution is, to the extent of this inconsistency, of no force or effect."

Your past property rights have been recognized but the Constitution has made them unenforceable if the <sup>Federal</sup> Government so chooses.



As soon as the first all Western political party<sup>✓</sup> elected, by an overwhelming majority, a candidate at a by-election, Trudeau started to discredit their stand on individual property rights. He now claims Section 26 saves your past property rights. That section is rendered completely unenforceable by Section 52. In 52 property rights, the ones omitted from the constitution, are of no force or effect.

Now that our undemocratic Constitution is for all practical purposes an accomplished fact, <sup>THE LIBERALS HAD</sup> he ~~has~~ condescended to throw out re-assuring hints to an alarmed public, as to what it contains. The Constitution was concealed during <sup>THEIR</sup> his election and not a single Canadian was allowed to cast a vote as to what his future "entrenched" laws would be. We were treated to full page ads & TV programs (all at our expense) that consisted of symbolically, a single Canadian Goose flying across a sunset, and large photos of Trudeau dancing with an Arab, but it was extremely difficult for the average citizen to even get a copy of his future entrenched laws.

Broadbent is now hunched in a dark corner, keeping very silent and hoping the public will forget it was his parties vote that enable Trudeaus' will, his small eastern majority, to force this Constitution on an unsuspecting public.

At last Trudeau is now condescending, while he looks around for a better job, to reassure concerned & frightened Canadians that they really ~~haven't~~ haven't lost their property rights under his Constitution. He refused to allow the Opposition to debate property rights in Parliament, or give a serious reply to any concerned Canadian that enquired. <sup>DURING ITS PASSAGE</sup>

Now, after the Liberals lost 3 by-elections, one in Ontario, one in Quebec and what was more dangerous one in the West, he is throwing out, via the press reassurance. He now no longer denies his property rights omission from the constitution, but instead tells us Section 26 is all the protection for our property rights we need.



As soon as the first all Western political party by an overwhelming majority elected a candidate at a by-election, Trudeau started to discredit their stand on property rights. <sup>THE LOSS OF</sup> He now claims <sup>of the constitution</sup> Section 26 <sup>that is not true if recognizes these instances but does</sup> saves your past property rights. <sup>not</sup> That Section is rendered completely unenforceable by <sup>section 26</sup> Section 52. <sup>but</sup> In Section 52 property rights, the ones omitted from the <sup>not</sup> Constitution are of "no force or effect". <sup>but</sup> <sup>unenforceable</sup>

Now that our undemocratic Constitution is for all practical purposes an accomplished fact, the Liberals have condescended to throw out reassuring hints to an alarmed public, as to what it contains. The Constitution was concealed during their election and not a single Canadian was allowed to cast a vote as to what his future "entrenched" laws would be. We were treated to full page ads and TV programs (all at our expense) that consisted of symbolically, a single Canadian Goose flying across a sunset, and large photos of Trudeau dancing with an Arab, but it was extremely difficult for the average citizen to even get a copy of his future entrenched laws. <sup>now would he discuss his omission of property rights from the constitution that severely worried all Canadians</sup> Broadbent is now hunched in a dark corner, keeping very silent and hoping the public will now forget it was his party's vote that enabled Trudeau with his small eastern majority, to force this Constitution on an unsuspecting public.

<sup>now</sup> At last Trudeau is ~~now~~ condescending, while he looks around for a better job, to reassure concerned and frightened Canadians that they really have not lost their property rights under his Constitution. ~~He refused to allow the Opposition to debate property rights in Parliament, or give a serious reply to any concerned Canadian that enquired during its passage.~~







Now when for all practical purposes the Constitution has become the <sup>unquestioned</sup> Supreme Law of Canada and since the surprise appearance of the Constitution the Liberals have had <sup>LOST THREE</sup> ~~three~~ unsuccessful by-elections - one in Quebec, one in Ontario and now one in Western Canada. Now the Liberals have decided <sup>when</sup> to calm seriously troubled waters. They admit, <sup>also now for all</sup> for the first time, the omission of property rights from the Constitution <sup>after all there is nothing you can do Trudeau's conduct is now so m</sup> on February 23rd to the press but reassured <sup>THE NOW VISIBLY THAT THEIR</sup> an angry West, <sup>AND SO ARE</sup> past property rights are <sup>INC</sup> ~~already~~ protected by Section 26 and claim the Western Party's fear of the loss of property rights is totally unfounded and, therefore, their political success can be ignored.

3

Broadbent is wisely keeping very quiet and hunched in a dark corner, he is hoping the public will just forget it was his NDP Party's vote that enabled the Liberals with their small majority from Central Canada, that forced this Constitution on Canadians.

THE SECTION THEY NOW TELL YOU WILL SAVE THE PROPERTY RIGHTS THEY TOOK AWAY

Section 26 is one of the last minute additions to the Constitution before it went to London. It was, unfortunately, signed by the weary Premiers, who Trudeau had labelled "the gang of eight"; with Levesque wisely withholding his signature. Section 26 on page 9 of the Constitution reads "The guarantee in this Charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed as denying the existence of any other rights or freedoms that exist in Canada".

Property rights are omitted from the Charter and therefore would qualify as one of the "any other rights or freedoms" that existed before the Constitution. The guarantee is not that these past rights and freedoms will be enforced, -it is simply their existence will not be denied. Their existence will be recognized but they are not necessarily enforceable.



As soon as the first all Western political party elected, by an overwhelming majority, a candidate at a by-election, Trudeau started to discredit their stand on individual property rights. He now claims Section 26 saves your past property rights. That Section is rendered completely unenforceable by Section 52. In 52, property rights, the ones omitted from the constitution, are of no force or effect.

Now that our undemocratic constitution is for all practical purposes an accomplished fact, he has condescended to throw out re-assuring hints to an alarmed public, as to what it contains. The Constitution was concealed during his election and not a single Canadian was allowed to cast a vote as to what his future "entrenched" laws would be. We were treated to full page ads & TV programs (all at our expense) that consisted of symbolically, a single Canadian Goose flying across a sunset, & large photos of Trudeau dancing with an Arab, but it was extremely difficult for the average citizen to even get a copy of his future entrenched laws.

Broadbent is now hunched in a dark corner, keeping very silent & hoping the public will forget it was his parties vote that enabled Trudeaus' will & his small eastern majority, to force this Constitution on an unsuspecting public.

At last Trudeau is now condescending, while he looks around for a better job, to reassure concerned & frightened Canadians that they really haven't lost their property rights under his constitution. He refused to allow the opposition to debate property rights in Parliament, or give a serious reply to any concerned Canadian that enquired.

Now, after the Liberals lost 3 byelections, one in Ontario, one in Quebec, and what was more dangerous one in the West, he is throwing out via the press reassurance He now no longer denies his property rights omission from the constitution, but instead tells us Section 26 is all the protection for our property rights we need. Having robbed us of our rights, he is now trying to tell us, his victims, we weren't robbed.

His office quotes Section 26 to back this up. Let's look at Section 26 on page 9 of the final Constitution. This Section was a last minute addition. It reads -- "the guarantee in this Charter of certain Rights & Freedoms shall not be construed as denying the Existence of any other rights or freedoms that exist in Canada". The "guarantee" referred to is contained in Section one, page 3. This Section has been criticized by the Canadian Bar Association and many Civil Liberty organizations for being too vague and containing discretionary phrases. It is & I quote "Subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society".

Many totalitarian states call themselves free & democratic so that is no reliable measure. Who will decide what is reasonable & who will decide if it is justified? The choice will be only the governments. They will decide what your rights will be, they & possibly an appointed court whose freedom was not assured as it is in the American Constitution. This is no simple declaration that "each person has the right" as we previously had. All the rights given in the Constitution guarantee are uncertain & liable to government interference at any time but this is especially true of property rights which were omitted.

To continue with Section 26, take note it only says that it doesn't "deny the existence of any other right or freedoms that exist in Canada". It does not guarantee that your past rights will be enforceable. It only says nothing will prevent you from pleading them. By Section 26, we can plead our ancient property rights & those contained in past statutes, but nothing in Section 26 says property rights will be enforceable. A right that is unenforceable is of no value at all. What rights will be enforceable?



As soon as the first all Western political party by an overwhelming majority elected a candidate at a by-election, Trudeau started to discredit their stand on property rights. He now claims Section 26 saves your past property rights. *In my opinion that statement is about as accurate as* ~~That~~ Section<sup>26</sup> is rendered completely unenforceable by *these* Section 52. In Section 52 property rights, the ones omitted from the *that got* Constitution are *run* *election* *in Que* *that he* *would* *save* *several* *times* *over* of "no force or effect".

Now that our undemocratic Constitution is for all practical purposes an accomplished fact, the Liberals have condescended to throw out reassuring hints to an alarmed public, as to what it contains. The Constitution was concealed during their election and not a single Canadian was allowed to cast a vote as to what his future "entrenched" laws would be. We were treated to full page ads and TV programs (all at our expense) that consisted of symbolically, a single Canadian Goose flying across a sunset, and large photos of Trudeau dancing with an Arab, but it was extremely difficult for the average citizen to even get a copy of his future entrenched laws.

Broadbent is now hunched in a dark corner, keeping very silent and hoping the public will now forget it was his party's vote that enabled Trudeau with his small eastern majority, to force this Constitution on an unsuspecting public.

At last Trudeau is now condescending, while he looks around for a better job, to reassure concerned and frightened Canadians that they really have not lost their property rights under his Constitution. He refused to allow the Opposition to debate property rights in Parliament, or give a serious reply to any concerned Canadian that enquired during its passage.



Having robbed us of our rights, he is now trying to tell us, <sup>WE THE</sup> his victims,

<sup>REALLY</sup> THAT we weren't robbed.

THE LIBERALS

~~His office~~ quotes Section 26 to back this up. Let's look at Section 26 on page 9 of the final Constitution. This Section was a last minute addition. It reads "the guarantee in this Charter of certain Rights & Freedoms shall not be construed as denying the Existence of any other rights or Freedoms that exist in Canada. <sup>TO UNDERSTAND</sup> The "guarantee" referred to is <sup>SEE</sup> ~~contained in~~ Section one, page 3. This <sup>GUARANTEE</sup> Section has been criticized by the Canddian Bar Association and many Civil Liberities organizations for being too vague and containing discretionary phrases. <sup>THIS GUARANTEE SECTION (1) SAYS ANY GUARANTEE IS</sup> ~~It is & I quote~~ "Subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstratably justified in a free and democratic society."

Many totalittrian states call themselves free & democratic so that is no reliable ,measure. Who will decide what is reasonable & who will decide if it is justified? The choice will be ~~only~~ the governments. They will decide what your rights shall be, they & possibly an appointed court whose freedom was not assured as it is in the American Constitution. This is no simple

<sup>SO CALLED</sup> ~~GUARANTEED~~ <sup>GUARANTEED</sup> ~~rights~~ given in the Constitution ~~guarantee~~ are uncertain & liable to governments interference at any time, but <sup>IN THE CASE OF PROPERTY</sup> this is especially true of property rights which were omitted. ~~AND~~ ~~THEY~~ ~~WERE~~ ~~COMPLETELY~~ ~~YOU~~ ~~CAN'T~~ ~~GUARANTEE~~ ~~AND~~ ~~BEING~~ ~~INCONSISTANT~~ ~~AND~~ ~~SO~~ ~~ARE~~ ~~CLEARLY~~ ~~NOT~~ ~~GUARANTEED~~ ~~IN~~ ~~ANY~~ ~~WAY~~ ~~ANY~~ ~~LONGER~~ ~~AT~~ ~~PROPERTY~~ ~~ALL.~~ <sup>THEY WERE COMPLETELY YOU CAN'T GUARANTEE</sup> <sup>AND BEING INCONSISTANT</sup> <sup>AND SO ARE CLEARLY NOT GUARANTEED IN ANY WAY ANY LONGER AT PROPERTY ALL.</sup> <sup>THE ONE TRUDEAU SAYS PROTECTS OUR RIGHTS</sup>

To continue with Section 26, take note, it only says that it doesn't "deny the existence of any other right or Freedoms that exist in Canada". It does <sup>SAY IT</sup> not guarantee that your past rights will be enforceable. It only says ~~nothing~~ <sup>THEY EXIST AND NOTHING PREVENTS</sup> ~~will prevent~~ you from pleading them. By Section 26, we can plead our ancient property rights and those contained in past statutes, but nothing in Section 26 says property rights will be enforceable. <sup>THAT SECTION</sup> AT ALL - JUST RECOGNIZED THE ~~THEIR~~ ~~EXISTENCE~~ ~~AND~~ ~~THAT~~ ~~IS~~ ~~ALL.~~

A right that is unenforceable is of no value at all. What rights will



The West has been backed  
into a corner by the conditions  
from which there is no escape  
unless they are now without  
are being oppressively taxed by  
oppressive federal laws ever  
without representation of their  
property rights or when their  
what has been so cherished by  
an independent immigrant area  
gone.



~~It is not given~~ Property rights are neither  
guaranteed or are they stated to  
be enforceable. They are only recognized  
as existing

Later in the constitution at  
<sup>now numbered</sup> section 53(1) ~~it is~~ <sup>in the final constitution</sup> a limiting or qualifying  
statement as to what the ~~existence~~

~~regarding the~~ <sup>rights</sup> omitted from the charter  
~~such as property rights~~  
& a statement that ~~clarifies~~ <sup>section</sup> to what  
degree ~~they~~ <sup>an omitted right</sup> can be enforced. It

reads "The constitution is the  
supreme law of Canada & any law  
that is inconsistent with the provision  
of the constitution is to the extent  
of the inconsistency, of no force or  
effect. Property rights were deliberately  
omitted they are ~~the other right~~

~~in section 26 that <sup>existence</sup> could only  
be recognized or not denied.~~

Therefore inconsistent and therefore  
of "no force or effect"

They ~~their~~ existence won't be  
denied <sup>by section 26</sup> but you have lost the



~~being governed by the~~  
~~the constitution~~  
had

~~His~~ office on March 24<sup>th</sup> in the globe

& mail made their first statement on

the now <sup>at last</sup> admittedly ~~embodied~~ <sup>from the</sup> ~~of property~~ <sup>constitution</sup>  
rights Trudeau <sup>office</sup> assured Canadians they <sup>who had been</sup> <sup>denied a chance</sup> <sup>to vote</sup> <sup>on</sup>  
constitution that he had not taken them away  
~~had not lost them~~. That statement

has as much validity as the promise

that got him elected, that Ontario

would get 17 cents a gallon cheaper.

~~The statement was made following~~  
gas. ~~The statement was made~~ <sup>the 1971</sup>  
~~To bolster this~~ <sup>Concepts election</sup>

To reassure frightened Canadian

he quoted section 26 of the constitution

& I advise all Canadians to read

that section for themselves & ~~not~~  
in its entire context in the constitution  
simply ~~take~~ accept another

statement from him.

Section 26 says.

The guarantees of in this charter  
of certain rights & freedoms shall  
not be construed as denying  
the existence of any other



1

On February 17<sup>th</sup> western Canada  
decided by an overwhelming  
majority <sup>at a</sup> by-election ~~decided~~ the ~~the~~

first candidate of the new  
party ~~of the~~ <sup>party</sup> ~~by an~~  
Western Concept ~~in an~~ <sup>by an</sup> overwhelming  
majority ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~Indian~~

immediately called ~~these~~ <sup>these</sup> racists and  
separatists, ~~whose~~ <sup>Mr Broadbent is wisely keeping very quiet his</sup> ~~platform~~ <sup>now a Robert everyone will forget it was his</sup> ~~On the 24<sup>th</sup>~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>platform</sup>

of February <sup>24<sup>th</sup></sup> <sup>office representative in the Labor Mail</sup> has announced <sup>the Western party</sup> ~~the~~ ~~platform~~  
platform based partially ~~on~~ <sup>on</sup> the

fact that the <sup>on</sup> <sup>pe</sup> ~~constitution~~ <sup>robbed</sup>  
them of <sup>via democratic</sup> ~~property~~ <sup>rights</sup> ~~rights~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~wrong~~ <sup>always</sup> <sup>and</sup> <sup>every</sup> <sup>fact</sup>

and ~~that~~ <sup>pointed out in</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>admitted to</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~omission~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~property~~ <sup>rights</sup>  
the omission of <sup>post</sup> ~~property~~ <sup>rights</sup>

from the ~~constitution~~ <sup>by the liberals & NDP</sup> but asserted

disurbed voters that their  
right to own property is guaranteed



Following the victory election.  
 A representative from the ~~press~~  
 Liberal Inquiries office tried to  
 reassure the public ~~that~~ individuals  
 that <sup>their</sup> property rights get adequate  
 protection <sup>in the constitution</sup> from section 26 of  
 the constitution. That section  
 only says an ~~on~~ the guarantee  
 in the charter does not deny  
 the "existence" of other rights &

freedoms in existence in Canada

~~These other rights qualify as "other rights to be"~~

~~Canada. Note it doesn't~~

But <sup>and</sup> ~~it~~ omitted property rights qualify as other rights, ~~Sec~~  
 26, actually confirms your ~~post~~

These other rights ~~will be enforced~~  
~~that~~ ~~a~~ rights, it only says its

rights ~~the~~ existence will not  
 be denied. in other words <sup>your existence</sup> recognized

To get it ~~confirmed~~ we are  
~~"other rights"~~



~~so your at~~

<sup>section</sup>

By 26 your ~~was~~ past laws were  
~~give~~ not denied to exist but their  
enforceability was not guaranteed.

~~The judge will consider section 26 + note  
it recognized your <sup>property</sup> rights but does  
not provide for enforcement for it  
by a court ~~for~~<sup>order</sup>. He will also note  
that ~~the~~ section 52 specifically provides  
that property rights have "no force or  
effect" + so can't be enforced by you,  
~~but~~.~~







In keeping with the both estate <sup>part</sup> role of being news reporters, equal space should be provided for the group who were called liars, to defend themselves against such a published charge in print.

On the interview both Trudeau's office & Peter Lougheed's office through his cabinet member Neil Crompton put forth the defense that <sup>individual</sup> Canadians property rights were ~~as~~ sufficiently protected by section 26 of the constitution. I will not try to interpret section 26 to your readers. Instead I suggest they get a copy of the final 10<sup>th</sup> edition of the constitution themselves & read it. It says -

Note Remembering that the N.O.P & Trudeau liberals deliberately omitted from our new constitution <sup>individual</sup> the property rights that were had been for 27 years law in Diefenbaker's Bill of Rights, you will see when you carefully read sect 26, ~~that~~ The omitted property rights are excluded from the guaranteed rights they <sup>are</sup> <sup>in essence</sup> <sup>from our past</sup> <sup>now</sup> are instead among the other rights <sup>in</sup> <sup>Canada</sup> ~~existence~~. What guarantee or assurance is given them? It does not state they



will be guaranteed, nor does it state they will be enforceable. It ~~merely~~ only says if you remove the double negative that their existence will be recognized.

To enforce ~~past~~ rights as it says in the constitution you may go to court, see?

If you are trying to prevent your neighbour or a bank from taking over your property, the judge will say your claims to <sup>your</sup> property rights are still "existing" + the laws of the past will protect you both & still will apply to your case as private citizens.

However on the other hand if it, is a government who is taking over the use of <sup>the individuals</sup> your land for the purpose of saving revenue for their government or <sup>taxing</sup> enforcing some "future opportunities" they wish to promote, then the judge will have to look at the enforceability of the government's take over.

Section 52 which is a fallowry & therefore limiting <sup>on a</sup> ~~is~~ statute ~~be~~ section in the constitution says -

Note your individual property rights were deliberately omitted from the rights given individuals under the



section 2-7

Your individual rights

constitution. They are out of the constitution they are "inconsistent" with the constitution

very clearly section 52 states they are now "of no force or effect", that is further

confirmed by the preceding phrase they

are "The constitution is the supreme law of Canada." Therefore <sup>the section</sup> overrides any past

statutes or court precedent decisions.

So the court would have to recognize

your cherished century old individual

property right do still exist - They are

still on the law books - but for you they

are not enforceable if under the constitution

now <sup>legally</sup> "the supreme law of Canada" the

government can show they were given <sup>a consular one</sup> a right over

property that is of ~~of~~ "force + effect" because

it is included in the right given

in the constitution <sup>that is</sup> ~~constant~~ will

the constitution

"consistent"

in the constitution to

That right given the governments

federally + provincially as in section

now numbered 36 in the final ~~the~~

constitution published

It reads - the government

translating it reads the provincial +

Federal governments can "Together <sup>and</sup> are

committed to" - enforce



a) Promoting opportunities for the benefit  
of Canadians"

Note the total lack of limitations ~~to~~

placed on what governments might consider

as only possible <sup>& hence for</sup> unimprovable opportunities.

They are not limited to property rights.

No individual can defend himself factually  
<sup>'future'</sup> against such a promotion being not

really for the advantage of Canadians. ~~to~~ <sup>an advantage</sup>

<sup>to consider would be to</sup> reduce the ridiculous public debt our

federal governments have assumed <sup>to keep power</sup> & now

<sup>will not be</sup> they include the possible purchase <sup>by an already elected</sup> with <sup>group</sup>

<sup>borrowed</sup> taxpayers' dollars of the world's largest

airplane manufactures & the billions

project. <sup>defense of</sup> ~~By~~ individuals' property rights

are lost: <sup>because they are released only on future approval</sup> The right ~~is~~ set out in the

Constitution & given to the government <sup>of the government is</sup>

in that it is "enforceable + in effect".

The individual <sup>rights are</sup> is not, he is left with

only recognition of the existence

(but not enforceable) of his past right,

Section 24 offers no Canadian

protection of his once cherished property

right. It instead insures the governments

both provincial & federal control over

these cherished rights. It will require they

pass a law to do that but you can't stop <sup>that</sup>

Property rights & the opportunities <sup>else</sup>  
they offered were why all Canadian



## HISTORY

Never in a democracy have a people been so deceived by their leader as the Canadian people have during Trudeau's attempt to force on a reluctant public an unneeded and unwanted and even in most cases, unseen Constitution. In his last election he completely concealed the Constitution from the voter, despite persistent questioning from the press and thus denied all voters the right to have a choice in their own Constitution - a Constitution should be "by the people".

During its passage he evoked closure to further conceal its controversial contents from the voter. Midway in its passage, he went on T.V. and announced he was passing the Constitution because "his people demanded it". Possibly his people did, but they weren't the Canadian people.

At that point in time, his party, with its very small majority, had been defeated in Ontario and Quebec by-elections. The Gallup poll had turned against Trudeau, Indians and women were marching with protest placards before Parliament, eight premiers had sued him and the Supreme Court had declared his method was outside the Constitutional conventional laws of Canada but he still insisted his people wanted it. *What Canadian people wanted it?*  
Now that there has been an upset victory of the new all western party, the Western Concept, who state they will oppose the Constitution, Trudeau has gone to the press and called the Western party rascists and bigots and accused them of lying to their electors about the contents of the Constitution. We have grown immune to Trudeau's arrogant name calling and recognize he prefers this to ~~his~~ balancing the budget, so that was ignored.



On February 24th in the Globe and Mail, a representative from Trudeau's office gave out a statement that the Western Concept party's platform, on which I advisered, was untrue. To be called a liar is something else and demands an answer.



Confused Canadians have been barraged for a year by continuous political deceptions. The most recent deception put forth in the Globe and Mail by the Liberals via Trudeau's office. It is - not to worry "Section 26 guarantees the existence of an individual's property rights"

On careful examination and taken in context with Section 53(1) and 36(1) all Canadians will, if they read the Constitution themselves, discover that Section 26 does not guarantee your property rights nor are those rights now even enforceable.

The clear understanding in the West of this loss of property rights is why the new "Western Party" had a recent surprising victory.

Ontario should be concerned now - concerned that Quebec has now refused to sign the Constitution and is threatening separation. Western Canada has now registered concrete evidence that they may resist living under this Constitution and that too could eventually lead to separation.

Ontario may find itself alone. Alone with Trudeau, ~~his~~ <sup>RIDDEN GOVERNMENT</sup> debts and his Constitution, alone as individuals without even their own guaranteed property rights, rights they need to protect them from a greedy government's takeover of their own property, to raise for the government desperately needed revenue.



Bring Set <sup>your</sup> voting delegates prepared to  
accept amending this constitution at the  
1982. Convention at Red Deer.  
+ bring the copy with you.

The ~~Amended~~ Constitution of W.C.C. - 1982 <sup>passed in June</sup>  
& superseding the first constitution passed in 1982

The name of the party as registered  
under the electoral act of Alberta,  
is the Western Canada Concept  
Party of Alberta otherwise  
known as the W.C.C.

### Participative

~~(a) To ensure all westerners  
to bring to all westerners  
to~~

(1) By peaceful & democratic means  
to bring as great a measure of  
economic independence to Western  
Canada as is possible <sup>disrupted and</sup> and to  
<sup>guarantee</sup> ~~insure~~ to each individual

Whether the right to life, liberty  
security of the person and enjoyment  
of property & the right not to be  
deprived, thereof except through  
due process of law.

(3) To ~~pro~~ retain & enlarge upon  
a policy political policy that



3) to ensure this to  
done by annually  
and being verbatim  
on a firm policy  
paper of  
objectives of  
the party

turn our objectives into a reality  
will make them <sup>of government</sup>

and is included in annually <sup>added</sup>  
~~set out~~ <sup>on</sup> our <sup>annual</sup> ~~policy~~ <sup>policy</sup>

~~annual~~ <sup>annual</sup> ~~policy~~ <sup>policy</sup> ~~paper~~ <sup>paper</sup> ~~is attached~~ <sup>is attached</sup>  
to the constitution

(4) To create a unique political  
party that <sup>in all ways</sup> ~~retains~~ <sup>is the party of an</sup> government  
~~supers~~ <sup>is</sup> government  
to the people, ~~and~~ <sup>run</sup> by the people,  
~~and to~~

### Membership in the party

Members of the party <sup>are all important</sup> will  
all <sup>be</sup> <sup>wife</sup> able to exercise a measure  
<sup>direct</sup> of control over the policies of the  
party, its elected officials, & through  
their elected legislative members  
a share in bringing sensible &  
good government to Allegra

### Memberships



The big-election victory of the first  
all Western candidate, has made

Eastern Canadians realize something does  
lie <sup>in the west area</sup> beyond <sup>(the great lakes)</sup> Manitoba's eastern border

beside oil + wheat, and that something  
is people. Any independant people

who are <sup>now</sup> ~~seriously~~ <sup>seriously</sup> concerned with

the central government's <sup>repressive</sup> ~~increasing~~ control  
of people who are <sup>refusing</sup> ~~now~~ ~~seriously~~ ~~and~~ ~~deliberately~~ to be governed  
~~and~~ ~~objecting~~ to ~~accepting~~ ~~being~~ governed

by a constitution that deprives them

of what <sup>is</sup> ~~they~~ <sup>view</sup> ~~regard~~ <sup>as</sup> ~~all~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~important~~  
~~use~~

individual <sup>unresponsible</sup> ~~rights~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~their~~ <sup>own</sup> ~~property~~  
and <sup>was</sup> ~~an~~ <sup>issue</sup> ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~by~~ ~~election~~

Not of importance of 1A

The constitution was concealed during

the last election campaign <sup>it</sup> ~~and~~ ~~was~~

passed without a single Canadian



1A

The ~~overwhelming~~ election of also  
~~a member of a Western separatist~~  
<sup>also at least</sup> party ~~also~~ flushed out the liberal  
Prime ministers office to ~~issue~~ <sup>condescendingly</sup> ~~issue~~ <sup>at least</sup>  
~~condescendingly~~ <sup>at least</sup> ~~issue~~ <sup>to the press</sup>  
a statement in the ~~Star~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~mail~~  
regarding property rights. They ~~at~~  
now admitted <sup>to the liberals</sup> ~~last~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~omitted~~ <sup>from the response</sup> but  
reassured <sup>know</sup> <sup>water</sup> ~~frigid~~ Canadians their  
property rights ~~have~~ <sup>have</sup> ample protection  
under section 26. This statement  
has ~~about~~ as much validity as  
the liberal  
their pre-election promises to  
<sup>had that</sup>  
Ontario they would get ~~lower~~  
gas 17 cents cheaper. gas 17  
cents cheaper. ( <sup>typists note</sup> back to bottom of  
page 1 )



5

Under the same Constitution government can use the equalization section where they have an enforceable right to take property. Read Section 36 of Page 11 where the provinces and the federal government are both committed to promoting opportunities for furthering economic development to reduce disparities of opportunities. In other words whenever the government think "it is" opportune for the future they can promote opportunities and nothing stops that being the seizure of your property. ~~if you have lost your enforceable right~~ their rights are enforceable & have no limitation at all & can include property rights. <sup>and</sup> You have your ancient rights but they are unenforceable. But the government has the force to institute a seizure if they so desire.



I

The by-election victory of the first all Western Candidate in Alberta has made Eastern Canadians realize <sup>THERE IS</sup> something besides wheat and oil ~~is~~ in the vast area west of the Great Lakes. That something is people. Independent people who are now <sup>CLEARLY POLITICALLY</sup> ~~visibly~~ enraged concerning the extensions ~~and increase~~ by the federal government of oppressive control. § People who are now refusing to be governed by a constitution that deprives them of what they regard as their right to their own property.

<sup>WESTERN</sup> The by-election also has at last flushed out a statement from the Prime Minister's office regarding property rights. <sup>THE LIBERALS NOW</sup> ~~They now state,~~ <sup>CONSTITUTIONS</sup> despite the deliberate omission of property rights from the ~~new~~ charter ~~which is in the Constitution,~~ <sup>THAT</sup> <sup>STILL</sup> Canadians get ample protection from Section 26. That statement has as much validity as <sup>TRUDEAU'S</sup> ~~his~~ pre-election ~~promise~~ to Ontario that they would get gas 17 cents a gallon cheaper if he were elected.



In a hypothetical case let's pretend your property is <sup>taken over by the</sup> seized. <sup>governor</sup> The  
only way to defend it in Canada is in court. You go to court showing a clear  
title and pleading the past laws that protected and had granted you a  
right to property. The judge will recognize the existence of those  
past laws and rights but the government can <sup>THEN</sup> whenever it desires plead  
Section 52(1) of the Constitution.

The Liberals never mention <sup>1)</sup> ~~this~~ Section. <sup>2)</sup> ~~It~~ <sup>WHICH</sup> says on page 18  
"The Constitution of Canada is the supreme law of Canada, and any  
law that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution is,  
to the extent of this inconsistency, of no force or effect." <sup>PROPERTY</sup>  
~~LAWS ARE INCONSISTANT AS THEY WERE DELIBERATELY OMITTED - SO THEY~~ <sup>ARE</sup>  
~~LAWS THAT APPLY TO THEM MAY BE RECOGNIZE BUT NOT ENFORCEABLE~~ <sup>AS</sup>

Your ~~past property rights have been recognized but~~ the Constitution <sup>SAYS</sup>  
has made them unenforceable if the <sup>Federal</sup> Government so chooses. <sup>THEY ARE</sup>  
~~AS THIS SECTION~~ <sup>CLEARLY STATES</sup> ~~SAYS OF NO FORCE OR EFFECT SO HAVE~~  
~~NO FORCE OR EFFECT - THAT YOUR RIGHTS ARE THERE BUT UNENFORCEABLE~~  
~~AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BECAUSE CLAIM BECAUSE~~

Under the same Constitution government can use the equalization section  
where they have an enforceable right to take property. <sup>then</sup> Read Section  
36 of Page 11 where the provinces and the federal government are both  
committed to promoting opportunities for furthering economic development  
to reduce disparities of opportunities. In other words whenever the  
government think it is opportune for the future they can promote  
opportunities and ~~nothing stops~~ <sup>YOU CAN'T INCLUDING C</sup> that ~~being~~ <sup>THEIR</sup> the seizure of your  
property. ~~AND USING IT FOR THEIR OWN PURPOSE OR THE OTHERS~~ <sup>THEIR CHANCE OF TRANSFER OF IT</sup>  
FOR WHOM THEY WISH TO "CREATE OPPORTUNITIES"

You have your ~~ancient~~ <sup>And</sup> rights but they are unenforceable. But the  
governments has ~~the force~~ <sup>RIGHT IS</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>ABLE</sup> institute a seizure if ~~they so desire~~ <sup>WHEN AND WHERE</sup>. <sup>CHOOSE</sup>  
~~WHEN & WHERE THEY CHOOSE~~ <sup>THEY CHOOSE</sup>

AND REMEMBER PROPERTY RIGHTS UNLESS SPECIFIED AS  
REAL OR PERSONAL INCLUDE EVERYTHING - LAND OR THE COAT  
ON YOUR BACK



*Dr. Ruth Gorman, O.C., B.A., LL.B.*

203 ROXBOROUGH ROAD S.W.  
CALGARY, ALBERTA, CANADA  
T2S 0R2

TELEPHONE (403) 243-0115

October 13, 1983.

Dear Chairman:

I think Mr. Ghitter you possibly know of my past association with the Indians of Alberta. For 21 years I was the unpaid solicitor for the Indian Association of Alberta. In that capacity, with the late Dr. John Laurie, I visited yearly the reserves of Alberta. Through three court hearings over a five year period, I fought the so-called "Hobema Case" and won it. Following that I was allowed to speak at Ottawa for three days to a joint Commission, the record of which is in Hansard - third session of the 24th parliament of 1960. As a result, I was instrumental in removing the compulsory enfranchisement section from the Indian Act which allowed reserve Indians in Canada to at last vote in Canadian elections. For that, I received the Order of Canada, an honorary doctorate, and was given by the Indians the honorary title of Queen Mother of the Cree, the name of Morning Star by the Hobema Indians and one from the Stoneys as "Princess Mountain White Eagle Girl".

I mention these provable facts merely to show I have been accepted as being familiar with Alberta Indians personally and the problems they face.

I will soon be seventy years old and for the past year I have been in poor health, due to illness caused by the paralyzing virus of the Gillian Barre Syndrome. For that reason, I would prefer to submit a written submission to the Committee concerning the insidious intolerance promoted by racial literature against the Indian race. I feel such a protest should be carried, not by an individual, but by the Indian Association of Alberta, the Council of Christians and Jews, of which I've been a past Executive member and possibly the Council of Church



Missionaries and other associations. However, to alert these persons to prepare and endorse a submission on such short notice will not be possible, but could be a continuing function of your Committee, one in which I would be glad to assist in a modest way. If the endorsement of the Indians could not be given, I would feel the submission lacked authenticity, and was not worthy of consideration.

The Indians are the persons directly abused in this field and although I as a fellow Canadian would indirectly suffer by the intolerance promoted in Canada by this type of literature, the problem should be identified and endorsed by them.

For this reason and because of my present partial illness and because I am attempting a slow (but I hope, permanent) recovery, I would prefer this be done with a minimum of publicity, if possible, with anonymity and in confidence and without a public appearance on my part.

Possibly a mere recommendation could be made to you, by me, which I would personally submit, that such a study should be initiated and that is what I would like to request from your Committee at this time.

The Indians on their reserves have lived for many years behind what the late Doctor John Laurie labeled "The Buckskin Curtain" enforced by the Indian Act. As a result, few Canadians personally know or understand Indians, except through what they read about them. If what they read is racist, it can promote a serious intolerant situation.

You must be aware that the problems created by the past teacher at Edson arose because of the literature he read, foremost of which was the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion". That book presented as factual was not based on facts but instead as an article in 1921 done by the London Times proved, was based on a German novel "Biarritz" published in 1868 and a French Satire published in 1864, neither of which were factual. However, because of their racist nature, these works of fiction have resulted in



promoting a world wide intolerance of ever-spreading racism that resulted in the Holocaust and even spread and created bitterness in a small Alberta town. For these two reasons, the danger of racist literature and the fact that Indians are largely known only by what is read about them, I feel it imperative that racist literature concerning the native people of Canada be kept out of school libraries and off school curriculum. I am not suggesting there be a censorship placed on any books, I am merely suggesting your Committee recommend that public funds do not be allotted to promote racism in literature in the schools, especially in the case of Indians.

To enforce this, I would like to recommend the setting up of a special committee to review books that individuals consider racist and list those unsuitable for school purchase or promotion to the schools.

My concern has been recently aroused by a racist book of so-called fiction concerning Indians that has recently been published by an award winning and therefore, acceptable author.

I would be glad to discuss this matter with either yourself or your Committee. My phone number is 243-0115.

Sincerely,

Ruth Gorman