

EFFORTS THROUGH FEDERAL M.P. MARLENE CATTERALL TO STOP THE CORRUPTION AT SNC.

[I first wrote to her about this on June 7th 1994](#) with a strongly-worded complaint about the behaviour of Canadian businessmen and lawyers, towards myself in particular.

[I followed this up with another letter on June 29th 1994](#) , after a conversation with her a few days previously in which she was attempting to say that "nothing can be done" and telling me to "get on with my life" notwithstanding the obstacles constantly being put in my way.

[My third letter to her, dated September 18th 1994,](#) dealt with the main points of my complaints against SNC and the compensation that I had demanded of them, out of court, in a letter that I had sent to their then-President and C.E.O., Guy Saint-Pierre. This was backed up with full documentation in the form of a 170-page binder. I also mentioned the possibility of filing an action "in mandamus" with the then-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada Antonio Lamer, who had approved Guy Saint-Pierre's investiture with the Order of Canada notwithstanding my written and documented objections to it. (Guy Saint-Pierre had allowed SNC's bank account at the Royal Bank of Canada to be seized in attempt to evade payment of the Quebec Superior Court judgement in my wrongful dismissal case. He was also kept on as a Director of the Royal Bank by then-President and C.E.O. Allan R. Taylor and his nominated successor John E. Cleghorn in spite of them being told what was going on).

[Marlene Catterall's reply to me of December 1st 1994](#) claimed that she could not do anything, and she made no attempt to support my idea of filing an action "in mandamus" with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. This was another instance of allowing protocol (otherwise known as **political correctness**) to prevent solution of a very serious problem. When she said,

"I have to conclude that any redress to which you believe you believe you are entitled can only be achieved through rt action, Court action, not through the political process."

- she, like everybody, ignores the question of where someone in my position, i.e. out of work, is supposed to find the money to pay lawyers. In other words she ignores the conditions that must apply for the activity to be possible. All it boiled down to, then (1994) as now (in 2011), is obfuscation designed to cause confusion, in other words hypocrisy applied for the purpose of enforcing the status quo in order to ensure that the problem would not be solved.