

I am a concerned Canadian one who is losing
hope for Canada's future. Why a constitution?
Was it only to give ~~Indians~~ ^{Indians} votes from ~~Indians~~ ^{Indians} by sneaking

Dear Mr Childs ^{in section 16 making all of Canada}
May I as a westerner thank you for ^{the personal}
your courage in speaking out on the ^{of the}
disastrous aspects of the present course ^{of the}
and the national government is relentlessly ^{of the}
pursuing.

My ancestors were U.C. loyalists & my ^{70 group}
father as a young lawyer was brought ^{wanted}
from Ontario by R.B. Bennett & I was born ^{it is}
in Calgary & for 17 years have lived here ^{not}
I've spent a lifetime mostly as a volunteer ^{even}
because I could afford that luxury of ^{the}
independence. I've been responsible ^{all}
for taking the cases & speaking at Ottawa ^{the}
to clear the opportunity for the Indians ^{the}
to get the vote. Again I have fought ^{the}
right for crippled person & was able ^{the}
to force the first public education in ^{the}
Alberta for crippled children. I served ^{the}
as a chairman for the civil liberties ^{the}
section of the Canadian Bar & as an ^{the}
advisory federally on Canada's first study ^{the}
on the Universal Charter of Rights. In my ^{the}
lifetime I have had to concern myself ^{the}
with the tragedy of persons who lack ^{the}
basic rights & so they have become truly ^{the}
valued in my mind.

I was never until lately a western
separatist. I accepted that as pioneers
in a sparsely occupied country one would
in a democracy of necessity receive the
short end of the stick while being compen-
sated by the sheer joy of living in a
pioneer area with all its opportunities
& comparative individual freedom of more
area & ^{less} restrictions.

It was with great shock I read the
const. proposed constitution. In nearly
every section I found powers of both
law were being taken from the courts in the
economic control from the provinces ^{the very vague terms of a constitution are inoperative in law & of no account whatsoever}
& individual rights from the individual ^{even to the point of the right to property}
by a powerful centralized state ^{even to the point of the right to property}

even to
voluntary
of his
almost
base the
right to own
property

A constitution the Western provinces
were being given no chance to ~~to~~ to
vote on in acceptance, or in the future
to amending. I feel I have been
disfranchised - something I would not
choose to live under. A democracy has
been my one aim in life. I accepted the
limitations under our past system

but I can not accept a continuing future for my grandchildren of such loss of rights

I began by writing letters to the paper pointing out what was happening to the average ~~man~~ citizen. At first I could not bare to point out how serious this

constitution was. I regard its sections as positively inflammatory & I am aware there is nothing sadder than a small country (in world affairs & power) than for it to be divided within itself.) But eventually I felt it dishonest. You realize the

individuals even basic property rights that once lay in Diefenbaker's Charter has now been dropped. Qualification to

vague & unlimited in the hands of a central government where the west vote can never be effective as proven by the last election, as I regard from an western viewpoint as that assumed & could be used all too easily by an unprincipalled totalitarian type of political belief. Unless some equality

Most serious are the many omissions of
past rights & most serious of all is
that in our legal rights. ~~per.~~ an
individual, a coops, a provinces right to
own property is now completely omitted

In Deffenbacher its said

Also in United nations

most ^{major} vital right we have.

I hate to ^{interrupt} ~~break~~ ^{Herald letter writer} into R. Roberson
Of Okolob's ^{to} laughter - its so rare
in these troubled days. but I'm
afraid I must ask him to ^{just stop} ~~stop~~
for a second, ^{long enough} ~~listen to the~~ ^{to listen to} the factual
news. He was ~~laughing~~ ^{laughing himself will} ~~because~~ ^{laugh}
~~was so delighted~~ Fuddeau was
going to fix the ^{etc} foreign oil companies
& Canadians were going to own
their own resources.

I wonder which way he prefers it
to have Fuddeau ^{new taken} ~~just~~ take the tax
dollars ^{out of his pocket} ~~to~~ ^{even} pay Imperial Oil
40 million dollars to go back & do
the job they were doing without the loan
~~pay before~~ ^{before} Fuddeau interfered? Or
is he rolling in the aisles at the
prospect of this winter ^{having to} ~~paying~~ at
the gas pumps for gas that costs
^{double} ~~three~~ as high ^{what} ~~than~~ the ^{products} ~~alberta~~ ^{produced} ~~gas~~ ^{but maybe he wants to} ~~did~~ ^{keep the}
in Canada sir) ^{while} ~~happy~~ ^{while} ~~albertans~~ ^{pay} ~~pay~~
~~While~~ ^{and} ~~But~~ ^{they will laugh} ~~maybe~~ ^{if} ~~he~~ ^{can} ~~stop~~
laughing he might take a peak at

his new constitution' that ^{factually he can reach the} doesn't
^{even bother to} give a single right to ^{an individual or a firm} own property
No ~~doubt~~ ^{anybody} although it gives him lots
of others? ^{very usefully defined rights} There is no other constitution
in the world including the United
Nations charter that deliberately omits
that ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ countries like Russia they
don't and he might consider what
is going to be like for legal Canada
Russia might but they didn't

And if he's still ~~long~~ got a giggle left
in his stock body he might try then
looking at the discretionary powers
in section 30 + 32 - ^{the} so called "equalization"
by which the federal govt can take ^{without any} government
resource funds. No proper
bill & democratic constitution can
ever have a discretionary clause. It just
^{really} undoes all the rights & ^{very more} even eliminates
the power of the courts - If its at
the government's discretion that it for
Please all time.

If he's still laughing ^{Mr Roberson may become quite} he's about the only
person in Canada that ^{is} ~~is~~ ^{is}, except of course
the bureaucrats that are going to manage
this new Canadian dictatorship. They are
the happy souls.

I found the personal attack
on Carl Neble by D R Dean revealed
amazing. Never have I ^{before} witnessed ^{in Canada}
~~the~~ such intolerance. Simply because ~~he~~
Neble has a different political
opinion than Deans and ~~the~~ Dean ^{has} ^{for reason only}
suggested they ^{for that reason} ~~should~~ ^{take away} ~~his~~ ^{Neble's}
citizenship. Neble's family lived in
Calgary all through the depression. His
talented mother played without salary
in the symphony for others enjoyment
Their family dwelt in a very small
basement suite because all their
money + their friends was going
into the search for oil. That very
^{who else} ^{shared} ^{the} ^{oil} ^{wealth} ^{today makes}
oil who ~~makes~~ Deane's good life
possible. When ^{the Nebles} they found oil, Carl
took a real cut in salary to serve
his city as a member of parliament
& with ^{his family} ~~his~~ increased ^{oil wealth} wealth which
improved all Calgary ~~standards~~
was always shared. ^{family} ~~He~~ ^{gave away}
Calgary's standard ~~he~~ ^{gave away}
of living they gave away an immense
^{share of it} ~~share~~ to create a free for every citizen
beautiful museum in Calgary
Yet now because his political

Opinion happens to differ with
this person ~~who~~ they calmly suggest ^{we}
^{should} just take away his citizenship
maybe this is the kind of ^{Canadian} ~~that~~ ^{that} ~~envisioned~~ ^{by}
~~that goes with~~ those who ~~are~~ ^{in that}
supporting ^{our new} a constitution, ^{in that} ~~which~~
~~in so~~ ^{has} ^{it} ^{does not} ^{assure}
an individual ^{no} ^{dependence} ^{on} ^{rights} ^{by} ^{section}
Citizenship ^{to} ^{as} ^{by} ^{section 1} ^{rights & freedoms} ^{are}
& freedoms ^{are} - Only to such
^{that} ^{that} ^{with} -
reasonable limits ~~limits as are~~ ^{are}
accepted" by ~~the~~ ^{the} parliament & I
presume that ^{means} the political party ^{who} ^{happen to}
power - no fixed rights ⁱⁿ ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{majority}
acceptable. And of course ^{who} ^{these} ^{so called}
~~the~~ ^{the} ^{new} Canadians are also endorsing a
constitution that nowhere give the
individual a right to ^{every} ^{own} ^{property}
but then of course the constitution
only came ^{into being} ^{really} so a right could be
perpetrated of property rights.
Legally the revenue ^{from} ^{our} ^{resources}
are ^{Alberta} ^{who} ^{developed} ^{them} ^{when}
now ^{they} ^{are} ^{developed} ^{that} ^{property}
right is to be ^{just} ^{taken} ^{by} ^{the} ^{parliament} ^{of}
^{Canada}
So possibly we should not be so
amazed ^{that} ^{kind of} ^a ^{constitution} ^{also}
~~one~~ ^{one} ^{lose} ^{their} ^{Canadian}
citizenship if they ^{don't} ^{agree}
^{than} ^{with} ^{them}. It's not the Canada I
brow & loved nor can believe in
especially when you ~~can~~ ^{see} ^{how}
without a single ^{single} ^{factor} ^{except}
a ^{poor} ^{they} ^{can} ^{attack} ^a ^{longtime}
good citizen like Carl Meeker & ~~even~~
~~try to~~ ^{even} ^{try to} ^{threaten} ^{him} ^{with}
the loss of his citizenship. This is
dictatorial not Canadian.