

Dear Sirs

I would like to commend and
thank your organization for publishing
my article on the dangers ~~of~~ ^{of} the new
~~proposed Canadian Constitution~~
and the threat it holds for the future
for Canadians proposed constitution
held for all Canadians but especially
so for property holders. I was amazed
to discover from the many phone calls
I received that Winnipeggers had ~~not~~
practically no information on the
constitution. The article you re-published
was first published ^{as the last of 3 articles in} in ~~last~~ January,
almost 7 months ago in the Calgary
Herald. Following its publication many
organizations reproduced it & mailed it
across Canada. Mr O'Callaghan publisher
of the Edmonton Journal ~~to~~ reproduced
it giving it almost full page coverage
with illustrations, the Financial Post
wrote an editorial based on it and
Mr Peter Worthington of the Sun chain

of papers wrote a column on it & it was republished in most of the eastern Sun papers. It has also been republished by an Edinburgh Scotland paper & a London England paper & two American papers as well as the A.P. press, published it. So I am amazed Winnipeg were to unaware of it and there was surprising resistance to it from your Winnipeg Papers & a radio station.

I am an independant lawyer not affiliated with any political party or sepralist party ^{but} ^{who} fortunately ^{my} had a ⁱⁿ ^{consulting} ^{law.} ^I ^{required} ^{that} background ^{when} over 20 years ago when I fought as an unpaid volunteer ^{my} friends the Indians court cases & spoke to the Canadian parliament and thereby cleared the way for them to at last obtain the vote. Since then I ^{have} ^{also} served on the civil liberties of the Canadian bar & as an advisor to the federal government ^{concerning} when they were considering Canada's Bill of Rights, ^{on} & advised the federal government on the Canada's position ^{on} ^{the} ^{as} ^{to} ^{the} ^{United} ^{Nations} ^{Charter} of Human Rights.

With this kind of background I was appalled with ~~our present Canadian~~ when I first read the present proposed Canadian Constitution ^{and discovered it} ~~lacked~~ even basic democratic rights of the individual ^{to hold property,} Canadians have never ~~had~~ like England have never had a written Constitution. They have found they function best under the great common law established in our courts and based on precedent and statute law which is passed by an elected parliament ^{is flexible and} & as a result can be changed easily & altered at the will of the people, ~~the elections~~. Canada had no need or desire for a constitution for 114 years we have functioned in freedom and with prosperity. In fact the only countries in this century who have passed rigid constitutions are the communist countries Russia China Cuba & "the ^{dictator} banana republics" of South America & Africa. In those countries just as now in Canada the constitutions were passed by the political parties at the top & then enforced on the people below. No Canadian has been given a chance to vote on

This constitution at all. It was not even mentioned at the last election yet immediately after the election it was introduced by the Trudeau government & ^{passed} with the support only of the liberal ~~party~~ ^{from} Ontario, Quebec & New Brunswick by that majority as being forced onto Canadians. Most Canadians have not even seen the constitution which will be the rigid law that governs them & their children the entrenched unchangeable law. Our elected members in parliament by ^{forced} enclosure were armed guards present were even prevented from debating it in parliament. Since then it has been semi-concealed behind the closed doors of a ^{special} parliamentary committee appointed by Trudeau & before which you could only appear by invitation and the closed doors of the Supreme Court of Canada. It ^{may even} will possibly be passed as binding law on Canadians not by our parliament but by England's parliament. The Canadian voter has had no choice in this matter. That was why I felt as a lawyer I

should at least "alert" the average Canadian as to what was happening to his country & his children's future. That was my reason for writing the article you republished.

It has of course been sent to all members & cabinet members & opposition leaders of our Canadian parliament & to the members of England's House of Commons & the Peers of the House of Lords. The reaction to the article has been mixed, naturally. Mr Broadbent's replies to his supporters who wrote him would seem to be he calls it ~~rediculous~~ exaggeration ~~composed of~~ to the point of ridiculousness. The liberal members frequently reply to ~~members~~ ~~to~~ supporters who send it to them "I am over-reaching" - However no one to date has declared it false or untrue. In the article I do not opine or I simply quote the actual words of your future constitution. The liberal party's defense at first was they didn't deprive the ordinary Canadian

c

of his hard-earned right to own property. That of course was untenable as ~~no~~ they have omitted the individuals past property rights from the constitution. These latest ~~defense~~ political party supporters defense which they put out in unreason is "Well it true we omitted the past guarantees of individuals right to own property - but we did so because at the request of the Provincial Premiers". At past conferences all held prior to the constitution's sudden surprising appearance the Provincial premiers did point out to the Federal government they already held vast areas of land & control them within the provinces in parks & so called "Crown land". Rightly so the provinces felt this interfered with their right of control & revenue of land within their province. Certainly now the argument that they ~~do~~ omitted ~~party~~ property rights to protect the provinces becomes