

Then they stood by until the fall of 1977, and ignored the fact that Canadian Javelin failed to comply with the attachment and paid out to Mr. Doyle a million and a half dollars through a company in the Bahamas. They paid the money to Javelin Exports Limited in the Bahamas and Javelin Exports would pay Doyle—all the money coming from Canadian Javelin. This was done in defiance of the government's attachment of 1964, and nothing was done about it. Nothing was done in the ensuing 13 years until I got after them.

The whole thing reeks of influence, of political skullduggery and corruption. We want to see an inquiry established and to know how this happened. What instructions were given to ministers? When were reports of these matters made to ministers? What did those ministers say when it was reported to them down through the years?

As I say, I wrote the Prime Minister a memorandum. It was six pages in length, and I do not have time to read it all into the record. To put this matter in its best light, Mr. Speaker, is to call it willful and wanton misconduct. But I suspect it is really much worse than that. Mr. Doyle has been a Liberal and has been involved on the fringes of the Liberal party for many, many years. He was an intimate of Premier Smallwood of Newfoundland who interceded on his behalf in Ottawa many times. If we ever get a look at those files we shall see that Doyle was an intimate of Mr. Smallwood, an intimate of Mr. Pickersgill. I believe even the Prime Minister knows him. He was involved in Quebec politics for years.

Some books—and I might mention volume III of the memoirs of the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert—referred to certain activities which took place in 1963 when a change of government took place in this country. There is a lot under the surface in connection with this matter, Mr. Speaker. We will never know, of course, just what is behind it until the government agrees to hold a proper investigation. I really hope that if an investigation is held it will find there is no corruption, that there is nothing to be discovered and that it is all above board. But I must say that, even if there is no corruption, there is monumental incompetence, the worst kind of negligence, and the worst kind of malfeasance in office.

I asked a question of the Minister of National Revenue the other day and in his reply he told me that there are 14 people in Canada who owe over one million dollars in income tax, as at March 31. One of them owes over \$5 million. That is brother Doyle. I am told that the average amount owed by some 613,000 taxpayers is \$846. I guess Mr. Doyle really brings that average up with his debt of over \$5 million. That is the kind of information I can get from the department, but no information is available to me for the years 1954 to 1977.

Other information I have been unable to obtain concerns how many people put up bank guarantees when they appeal, how many have to pay their taxes, and so on. But in the annual report which comes before this House it is said that the taxpayer has to pay up every time he is reassessed. I quote from that report:

Summer Recess

It has been the practice of National Revenue that taxes assessed against a taxpayer must be paid whether or not there is an objection or an appeal by the taxpayer.

In this connection I refer to the Annual Report of the Department of National Revenue entitled "Inside Taxation", page 40. It states:

During appeal periods the amount assessed must be paid whether or not there is an objection or appeal outstanding. In certain circumstances the department may accept collateral security for the amount of the debt until the issue is resolved.

As a member of this House, I brought this matter to the attention of the Prime Minister thinking, in my foolish innocence, that the Prime Minister of the country would be interested in the fair and proper administration of the tax laws. I thought he would be interested in making sure that any allegation I have set out in my memorandum is wrong. As can be seen from a glance at the right hon. gentleman's answers in *Hansard* today, he does not care, just as he does not care, in my opinion, about national unity except in a partisan sense; just as the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) does not care about national unity but will use any kind of skullduggery, thuggery and skuggery to try to keep in office, even to the extent of suggesting that members of this House are racially biased.

Are the people of Canada prepared to tolerate this kind of stinking mess the government will not make any attempt to find out about? If there was one thing I always thought, Mr. Speaker, it was that taxpayers were always treated alike. Yet here we have definite proof, beyond any doubt, that taxpayers are not treated equally. One powerful taxpayer with dozens of lawyers in his employ has been able to go for 28 years without paying his taxes. For the last 15 of those years the party opposite has been in power, and for the last ten of them the government has been headed by the Prime Minister. Why is this so? The whole matter cries for a complete public investigation of our tax system, how our taxes are imposed, how they are collected, what security is taken when the Crown reassesses you. The whole thing has to come under the most open kind of scrutiny. There is something wrong with our laws when a company such as Javelin can be raped and raped again, its assets taken out of the country and given over to Mr. John C. Doyle in the Bahamas, in Panama, in Costa Rica, and its shareholders helpless to do anything about it. Twelve thousand shareholders own a few hundred shares each, and there are no major shareholders. It has a captive and subservient board.

● (1722)

Our laws have got to be changed, Mr. Speaker. We can do better than this. A year ago last May the inspector was appointed, and Mr. Doyle has him tied up in court. I have one of the judgments here today, and Mr. Doyle has got other actions going on in Montreal to prevent the government from selling the few scrawny shares they have got in Canadian Javelin, that he owns, to try to collect some of the tax that he owes. Mr. Speaker, that's why I wanted to speak on the adjournment debate, because when we adjourn this is the time to bring forward grievances, and I would like the parliamen-