

CONSTITUTIONAL CONTROVERSY

No wish for Big Mother

Dear Editor,

When the Accord was reached I was disposed to vote for it because it finally recognized the people of the First Nations as full citizens of Canada and also took the giant step of creating an elected Senate. Realizing that this was probably the best we could get at this time, I believed that we should accept it.

I was prepared to wait until later to regain the right to own property, to re-establish the supremacy of the people and the right to trade freely.

Today I finally received the "unedited text of the agreement" circulated by the federal government.

The Constitution is supposed to be a framework which defends our individual rights, the supremacy of the people, and the permanent continuation of democracy (i.e. government by representatives elected by the majority of the people). The Constitution is not supposed to pre-determine what brand of politics governments pursue. That is decided by the representatives chosen by the electors, and the Acts of Legislatures, and the House of Commons.

But this accord would entrench in the constitution a socialist regime which would permit no relief from Big Mother Government smothering us with more and more multitudes of rules and inane restrictions, so unnecessary to self-reliant, competitive people as Canadians have always been.

Why do I say this? Because this accord commits all of our governments, federal and provincial, to

provide in perpetuity, and I quote: "food, shelter, clothing, health care, high quality primary and secondary education, equality of male and female persons, collective rights and freedoms, full employment, a reasonable standard of living, free movement of goods, services and capital."

All without any demands for any effort by the recipients! Don't get up in the morning, don't do any work, someone else will take care of it, just draw your monthly cheque, Big Mother will provide!

Do you believe in this? Can you believe in it? Of course not! It's a crock. Who is going to do all the producing of wealth if government provides all this for free? Obviously it can't. There is no free lunch. In any case, who wants one? Shouldn't there be something you have to do for yourself? Shouldn't there be something about your life that YOU achieved?

Since the accord would stick us with the unanimity requirement, (once again), for any significant change to the Constitution, it would doom us forever, or until the collapse of our governmental system, whichever comes first, to the same disastrous ruin of our country as happened to the USSR.

I don't want to see the Canada I love reduced to such a miserable shadow of itself. So I'm sorry, I am going to vote "NO" and urge everyone I know to do the same.

Jim Stock

Leader of the Ontario
Libertarian Party

Building a stronger Canada starts with a Yes vote

Dear Editor,

Canada, our home, needs help.

The Charlottetown Accord - otherwise known as the Consensus Report on the Constitution - is in danger of becoming the Charlottetown Discard.

We cannot afford to let that happen.

On October 26, you will be asked to mark either YES or NO on the referendum ballot. As president of the Greater Toronto Home Builders' Association, I urge you to vote YES.

This is not about the leadership of this country. Leaders come and go. This is about the survival of the country. The world is watching nervously as we decide our own fate.

Through political and economic strife we have endured. Canadian peacekeepers are second to none as they perform admirably for the United Nations - a stable nation helping to restore stability to one troubled region or another around the world.

We are confident experts at solving other countries' problems, yet we seem to be bumbling novices at dealing with dilemmas in our own backyard.

Make national unity your business, because your business depends on it.

A YES vote on national unity will restore a good measure of confidence to Canadians, a confidence that will help spur the economy. A NO vote will fuel confusion, doubt,

and insecurity.

The Charlottetown Accord is not perfect, but I believe it represents a sound balancing of the various interests of all participants. It deserves our support and encouragement.

It's time to write the Accord into the history books so our governments can focus on the Number One concern for most Canadians - restoring a healthy economy to this great country.

If you agree with this stance, please post this letter on your bulletin boards for your employees to read.

Astonishingly, there are still more than 100,000 unemployed construction workers in Ontario. Many analysts say a NO vote would cause further losses.

Thank you.

Claudio Cinapri
President

Greater Toronto Home
Builders' Association



Voting no for Canada - not against Quebec

Dear Editor

The following is an open letter to the people of Quebec. Copies have been sent to several newspapers in that province.

A letter from an Ontario Anglo to the people of Quebec - Oct. 6, 1992.

I'm voting "NO" for Canada on Oct. 26 and I hope you will do likewise. I am writing this letter to not only urge you to take this action but also to assure you that my "NO" vote is not a vote against Quebec.

It is a vote against that group of politicians and special interest groups who crafted a document of appeasement to each other that will forever ensure that my Canada is divided; who now use my tax dollars to try to convince me that I must vote for the document to keep my country together. I'm damn angry about it.

For example, my MP explains that Aboriginal self-government as outlined in the Consensus Report means the formation of perhaps two dozen self-governing communities, much like our present municipalities, who will be subject to federal and provincial laws.

This is an acceptable and comforting scenario until you read what the Charlottetown report says. It says (with my comments in brackets):

a) Paragraph 9 - "Aboriginal representation in the Senate should be guaranteed in the Constitution." (Welcome to political representation based on race.)

b) Paragraph 41 - "The recognition of the inherent right of self-government should be interpreted in the light of the recognition of Aboriginal governments as one of three orders of government in Canada. (We now have Federal, Provincial and Aboriginal levels of government.)

c) Paragraph 43 - "The legislative bodies of Aboriginal peoples should have access to section 33 of the Constitution Act, 1982 (the notwithstanding clause)..." (Legislative bodies??? Pause and have pity for aboriginal women's rights when the chiefs get their hands on that notwithstanding clause.)

d) Paragraph 47 - "A constitutional provision should ensure that federal and provincial laws will continue to apply until they are replaced by laws passed by the governments of Aboriginal peoples pursuant to their authority." (My MP says that this includes the Criminal Code of Canada.)

As much as I respect my MP, I have to disagree with him on this one. What's in the text does not support the idea of Aboriginal governments as being akin to municipi-

pal governments; it directly contradicts that idea and instead supports the formation of many more "nations" in this land. There's a test that anyone can apply to help judge if I'm correct. Ask any Aboriginal leader if he is now a proud Canadian and will he continue to be so when he achieves Aboriginal self-government. I think his answer will tell the whole story.

There's much more on this and other subjects covered by the Charlottetown agreement. The foregoing doesn't comfort me; it scares me. I see a land (it's no longer a country) with many "nations" struggling for their autonomy with different rules for some than others. Hell of a way to "bind" a nation together.

So I appeal to the people of Quebec. Don't take my "NO" as a vote against Quebec but as a vote for Canada. Vote "NO" with me. Don't be afraid of those who preach, rightly or wrongly, that there will be a price to be paid. We've paid whatever price has been necessary for our country before and we'll do so again.

We'll continue to try and settle our differences but perhaps one day it will be under politicians who can lead rather than appease.

Neil J. Mackinnon
Georgetown

British and Native heritage sadly overlooked

Dear Editor,

After reading Noel Duignan's "Queen's Park Report" in This Week's Oct. 10 issue, I felt I had to write.

He mentioned the fact that in 1931 the Statute of Westminster decreed that the United Kingdom could never again control Canadian laws, changing the course of Canada's history forever. The way he put it, it sounds as if the Brits did something wrong here in Canada, instead of making this country what it is today.

The British have a rich heritage here in Canada, but it never gets mentioned, especially in the schools. Even though her great-grandmother was a Canadian from Saskatchewan, my daughter never learned anything about Canada's significant history from school, except some boring details describing the political scene between the French and English in Upper Canada West and Lower Canada East (called Ontario and Quebec from 1867). Because of this she hates Canadian history, and I'm upset about that.

What about the explorers. Remember them? The major ones being Cabot, Cartier, Champlain and Cook, the farm laborer's son. What bothers me is all the celebrations going on in Ontario over Columbus and his discovery of America. The fact is that Columbus never reached this far. He remained south in the Caribbean.

Cabot was an Italian who later settled in England. In 1497 he sailed from Bristol, on a very small ship with a crew of 18, on behalf of England, under the flag of Henry VII. It was going to become one of the most important voyages in history, for instead of finding a new way to India, they landed instead on the eastern coast of Canada.

A year later, on his next voyage, he passed Baffin Island, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and New England. As there was no sign of eastern civilization, England later laid claim to North America. Not long after claiming Newfoundland for England, fishermen from the west coast of England were establishing themselves on that island.

And what about another great explorer and fur-trader, Sir Alexander Mackenzie. The Mackenzie River was named after this Scot. He discovered the river (the longest in Canada) in the 1790's when he crossed the Rockies on his overland journey to the Pacific.

All of us are here today in a country called "Canada"

because of the British involvement in this land. There wouldn't be a Canada as we know it today if the great English general, Wolfe, hadn't won a major victory in Quebec, on the Plains of Abraham in 1759. He was wounded three times and died before the battle with the French ended.

There wouldn't be a Canada as we know it today if the British hadn't carved out, once and for all, Canada's ultimate destiny. This happened in 1812, during the battle of Queenston Heights, when Captain Isaac Brock, born in one of the British Channel Islands in 1769, and the President of the Council of Upper Canada (as well as a distinguished military leader), led the British troops (redcoats) against the Americans. The Canadian militia (farmers) and Indians bravely fought alongside the British troops during this hard fought battle. Brock was killed, but Canada was saved and eventually became the fine nation it is today, with the British government's blessing.

This letter came about because I'm a little disturbed at hearing all the time here in Ontario about the French Canadians, their part in Canada's history, and being "distinct" because of it, but not a word about the Brits and their Canadian heritage.

It seems that Canada's youth is becoming more Americanized, and one of the problems is that they know next to nothing about their own country's eventful history: that history has allowed Canada to evolve into something uniquely Canadian, and appreciably different from America and all the other countries in the world.

We cannot allow Canada's history to be buried with the past, for if we do, this country is in fear of losing its very identity and becoming just another part of the United States.

Please, let us keep Canada's identity by recognizing that Canadians are what they are today because of the past. Let's be proud of this country's history and ALL the peoples that made it, and that includes Canada's native peoples.

It's about time they were included in all government decisions concerning Canada, for they played a noble and splendid part (and the longest) in this painful and moving, passionate and enthralling drama. They also sacrificed the most.

D.E. White
Georgetown

The British also have a rich heritage in Canada.