

Inquiries of the Ministry

General know that Mr. Rose was under surveillance and did he either approve or express any views about this?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it is quite true that Mr. Rose was under surveillance after Mr. Laporte was kidnapped and before the War Measures Act was proclaimed.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, was the Solicitor General consulted about Mr. Rose being kept under surveillance rather than arrested at that time?

Mr. McIlraith: He knew of it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanfield: After the escape from surveillance of Rose, did the Royal Canadian Mounted Police recommend that his picture be published promptly and was this recommendation not acted on and was this recommendation known to the Solicitor General?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the reason he was under surveillance and no warrant was issued for him was, of course, what must be obvious, that there was not at that time evidence against him to warrant the issuing of the warrant for his arrest.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Solicitor General whether he would reconsider and answer the question I asked? Did the RCMP recommend publication of Rose's picture and the offence, because I understand Rose's fingerprints were on an FLQ communiqué that had been received? Did the RCMP recommend at that time the publication of his picture and was this known to the Solicitor General?

Mr. McIlraith: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making assumptions about the details of evidence in this case. I do not propose at this point to give the details of the evidence that was available in connection with the warrant that has subsequently been issued for Mr. Rose. That is a well established practice in the House. I do, however, repeat what I said earlier, that the reason he was not arrested at the time he was under surveillance was that sufficient evidence was not available to permit the issuance of a warrant.

MURDER OF PIERRE LAPORTE, KIDNAPPING OF JAMES CROSS—OFFERING OF REWARD

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): In view of the negative results of the police investigations in both the Laporte and Cross cases so far, has the government now decided to offer a substantial reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the criminals involved in either of these two cases inasmuch as rewards have been helpful in solving criminal cases in the past?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I can only repeat what I sought to convey in earlier answers to the same question, that the matter of a reward is under very close consideration by the two governments at the present time and has been from day to day for some days.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: It takes them a long time to do the obvious.

Mr. Hees: As this matter has now been under consideration for several weeks and as the offering of a reward could prove very useful in solving either or both of these cases, would the minister advise the House what in the world is stopping the government from making this very constructive move?

Mr. McIlraith: It is very simple, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the minister as I have tried to be as lenient as possible in allowing questions and answers in connection with this matter. It seems to me that the original question asked by the hon. member was quite legitimate although it has been asked before, but his supplementary question is the same argument as has been made before. Perhaps we could hear the argument in response to it from the minister, but that will not advance the situation very much.

Mr. McIlraith: The answer is very simple. It is that the government prefers to take the advice of the police authorities responsible in this case, plus the advice of the responsible legal authorities, rather than the advice of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, that is the usual snide type of remark the Prime Minister makes. Can we not have a sensible answer to a constructive question on a most important matter?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[Translation]

KIDNAPPING OF JAMES CROSS—EFFICIENCY OF POLICE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary question.

Considering that more than a month has elapsed since Mr. James Cross was abducted and that the people of Canada are concerned about the delay in capturing the abductors, would the Solicitor General satisfy this House and the Canadian public that the searches are being carried out in a truly efficient way by the various police forces of Canada?

[English]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to give the House the assurance that effective police work is being done by all the responsible authorities in an attempt to solve these cases.

Mr. Woolliams: My question is not a supplementary but it is certainly related. In light of the Prime Minister's statement—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question would have to be supplementary before the Chair could recognize the hon. member now. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands would normally be recognized at this time unless there is a supplementary question.