

Unmasking of an Unsavoury Political Legacy in Dialogue Issue 32-1, Autumn 2018, p.24

Robin Mathews Uncut

WHO KILLED PIERRE LAPORTE?

By Robin Mathews, October, 2018

When Pierre Elliott Trudeau ‘undertook’ the October Crisis and unleashed The War Measures Act, (October 15, 1970) he faced significant criticism – especially from people in Quebec who accused him (to quote Tommy Douglas, NDP) of using “a sledge-hammer to crack a peanut.”

Trudeau imposed The War Measures Act, flooded an army into Quebec, seized (without arresting) around 500 Quebecers who opposed him politically and jailed them ... and conducted hundreds of “raids” on people’s homes, and even had cabinet member Jean Marchand say there were “three thousand” FLQ members, when there were ... at huge exaggeration ... maybe 20 who claimed to be FLQ.

There was no overall FLQ organization with any kind of structure or ‘membership’. A few people would make a “cell”, call it FLQ, and (maybe) release a communiqué making a demand. It was so easy to do the RCMP did it frequently themselves ... or did it with RCMP “moles” and unknowing others ... who would then set about working to blacken the name of *ANYONE* who wanted, legitimately, to work for Quebec independence.

In pursuit of Trudeau government goals, the RCMP “broke and entered”, thieved private files, burned down a barn in the country, made a theft of dynamite, and worked with double agents who acted criminally. Those are RCMP crimes *recorded*. Most weren’t.

Pierre Trudeau believed the democratic and open pursuit by some Quebecers of an independent state was totally unacceptable ... and so opposable by whatever form of action (legal or illegal) “the State” decided to undertake. The overwhelming body of Independentists were completely against violent methods *but Trudeau lumped them all together, purposefully blurring the lines.*

Little known to Canadians, Pierre Trudeau spent time at (U.S.) Harvard University doing ‘graduate studies’ (1944-5) where he wrote an intriguing long, (59 type-written pages) major essay called “A Theory of Political Violence.” In it, quite simply, he advocates criminal activity by the State. As for the population in a democratic state, Trudeau writes: “the mass of the people is an inert body with no will of its own. It obeys whatever force or power may be applied to it.” He uses the word “terrorism” to describe ‘positive’ violence undertaken *by the State*. And he posits three necessary rules for such political violence. (1) The method shall be chosen that is best apportioned to the desired end. (2) The method shall be applied implacably. (3) The method shall be subject to perfect control. And he wrote a charming gloss on those three rules: “If an action has been singled out as the most appropriate one ... it is sheer stupidity to begin belly-aching over its illegality. The superstitious fear of illegality has made more than one great man tremble and spoiled his aim.” (Max and Monique Memni, *Trudeau Transformed, 1944-1965*, McClelland and Stewart, 2011, pp. 28-35)

His U.S. professor reading the essay might be called a liberal democrat. He gave Trudeau the lowest grade the future Prime Minister of Canada received at Harvard – and probably in his whole academic career! In what one may see as an extension of those noble ideas, Prime Minister Trudeau created the little known May 7 (1970) Committee, which, on that day began to prepare to impose the War Measures Act – a statement that will be loudly denied. The Committee was put together seven days after the Quebec election in which the Parti Quebecois received 23% of the vote. It was tasked to find ways to strengthen the role of the Army and the RCMP... (?) [Richard Fidler, *RCMP The Real Subversives*, Vanguard Publications, 1978, pp. 23-24]

(Trudeau assumed – pretended? – that normal anti-criminal action couldn’t contain the very few – and usually known – violent actors.) The RCMP became – in the process – a criminal organization, and because of the gigantic failure of the McDonald Commission (1977-1981) to lay out cause and effect, and to demand a thorough cleansing of the RCMP – the Force has, some say, become an increasingly powerful, national criminal organization.

Claude Jean Devirieux (Radio Canada journalist) reports John Starnes, major RCMP superior, [“furious”] telling him the RCMP acted only on orders coming from “very high up.” The claim is, unhappily, true... or very close to it.

[Claude Jean Devirieux, *Derrière l'information officielle 1950-2000*, pp. 110, 111] Indeed, Devirieux marvels that from all the Commissions that went to work: "Finally, ouf! No one was convicted." And Jeff Sallot, in *Nobody Said No* (Lorimer, Toronto, 1979, p. 182) makes clear that two reports were presented to top cabinet committees about the matter of "RCMP or paid agents" engaging in criminal activity. Nothing was done by either committee – *both chaired by Pierre Elliott Trudeau*.

If proof is needed of the (in fact) criminal intent and action by some members of the Trudeau cabinet ... we must be clear that the *federal* "inquiry" into RCMP misdoings was forced upon the government. Francis Fox (solicitor general) had to try to keep ahead of an explosion of revelations *and* the creation of the Quebec Keable Inquiry to examine RCMP criminal acts. And so the federal Commission was arranged with the appointment of loyal Liberal David McDonald as chief commissioner. On June 16, 1977, the Parti Quebecois government set up the Keable Commission to look into RCMP crimes; on July 6, 1977, the federal McDonald Commission of Inquiry into Certain Activities of the RCMP was set up. No accident. The Liberal Cabinet did everything it could to frustrate the investigations of the Keable Commission ... even trying to have it declared unconstitutional - almost as an admission the RCMP was working criminally for the Liberal government led by Pierre Trudeau. [The McDonald Commission Report was presented to the federal Liberal government on January 6, 1981. On Sept. 24, 1980, Jean Francois Duchaine was appointed to look into October events, and released his final Report on January 27, 1981. On March 6, 1981 the Keable Commission Report was released.]

Trudeau set to work to defeat a democratic campaign for Quebec independence ... not by open, democratic persuasion and reform, but, it seems, *by subterfuge, force, and guile*. And in the mess that followed, the Acting Premier of Quebec, Pierre Laporte, was murdered *a day after the War Measures Act was imposed*. Of course, many people said he was murdered as a result of Trudeau's heavy-handed attack on Quebec... and ... moreover ... *to this very day no one (in the general public) can be sure who were the murderers of Pierre Laporte*.

Paul Rose (with others) was accused and tried and convicted. But the Duchaine Commission in Quebec ruled that it would have been impossible for Paul Rose to have committed the murder since he was, without question, in another part of the city when the murder happened! Francis Simard who (also) admitted to the murder carefully avoids any report of the event in his semi-autobiography. And Jacques Rose – also claiming responsibility - was convicted as an accessory *after the fact*... Confessions of the accused perpetrators are described as "unsigned."

Who killed Pierre Laporte? To cover over that difficulty, what almost seems to be a 'movement' to falsify the timeline of The October Crisis has been put in operation ... and still, I believe, is in operation. Recently, I went on the computer to look at entries on The War Measures Act and saw there that *because Pierre Laporte was murdered Trudeau imposed the War Measures Act*. A falsehood. *Pierre Trudeau imposed the War Measures Act ... and then ... Pierre Laporte was murdered*. But if people can be convinced Trudeau imposed the WMA *after and because of* the terrible, grisly murder of the Deputy Premier of Quebec ... then the War Measures Act might seem to have been imposed for intense, human reasons ... not for very questionable 'reasons of State'.

The false story has, it seems, long legs. In the (unsigned) entry for Pierre Laporte in the 1985 Canadian Encyclopaedia – which was sent to every school in Canada that had a library... and sold all over the country, readers are told the falsehood that the War Measures Act was imposed after (and because) Pierre Laporte was murdered (Vol. 2, p. 977). All the thousands of entries in that *Encyclopaedia* are signed ... except that (lying) one. Equally strange: *not a single history-making FLQ person* has an entry in that *Encyclopaedia*. Not one. Someone, it seems, is determined to erase the real history of the 1970 October Crisis ... and remake the life and political history of Pierre Trudeau.

The entry for Trudeau in that 1985 *Encyclopaedia* – (fittingly?) also misreports the event. Distinguished Canadian political scientist Reg Whitaker writes, in his signed entry, of "the kidnapping of British diplomat James Cross and the kidnapping and later murder of Quebec Cabinet minister Pierre Laporte by the terrorist FRONT DE LIBERATION DU QUEBEC (FLQ). In response, Trudeau invoked the WAR MEASURES ACT, with its extraordinary powers...." That statement, as already pointed out, *is completely incorrect!* (Canadian Encyclopaedia, Vol. 3, pp. 1855-56) David McDonald's work is, I believe, overall, a slavish matter of toadying to Cabinet wishes. To my mind, he failed to do work he should have done ... and permitted the burial of a huge amount that should have been reported to the public. Why did Pierre Trudeau reach half way across Canada to pick as chief Commissioner a Liberal (he knew personally) whose loyalty (at the very least) was assured? And why was that Liberal directed to report to the Liberal government which was under dark suspicion – and *not to the Canadian Parliament*? Several police forces, the army, Mountie

Moles, journalists ... and more were involved in the 1970 October Crisis (so-called). They competed often ... and tongues wagged... as follows: At least one Mountie Mole was present at the kidnap of James Cross, British Trade Commissioner. The hiding place was known from Day One (though the combined police forces of Canada claimed to be unable to find Cross!). [Devirieux, p. 52, pp. 186-190]

For the more than 50 days that Cross was held, the place was bugged and listened to 24 hours a day from an adjoining apartment. But the police didn't move to release him ... because it was a PUBLIC RELATIONS Kidnap

The *Gilbert and Sullivan* absurdity of it all was borne out when – very early in the “kidnap” – it was realized that James Cross needed regular medication and had none of the medicines with him. “Authorities” negotiated with a ‘Mole’ ... and he carried the medications to a kidnapper-contact who took them to Cross. BUT ... the gigantic national and Quebec intelligence/police forces were unable to use that trail to “find” James Cross! Subsequently, Devirieux reports he sought out the people ‘removed’ from the apartment above the kidnap place to make room for the RCMP “listeners.” He reports he “found himself facing an older man who became pale, showed signs of being terrified, and shut the door in my face.” (Devirieux, p. 188)

Before the abduction of Cross, his daughter, Susan, was seen at a café used by ‘radicals’ in Montreal, *The Prague*. She was also captured in a photograph (with her then husband) taken at the famous gathering place of Independentists at Percé the Gaspé region, called *La Maison du pecheur*. She was seen, too, some insist, in the company of Paul Rose at the school (Lachute High School) where she worked. Later, Claude Jean Devirieux, Radio Canada journalist, met her then ex-husband at *The Prague* and asked him what they were doing at *La Maison du pecheur*? The ex-husband of Susan Cross said (according to Devirieux) that he would answer the question for a payment of thirty-five thousand dollars. (Devirieux, pp. 68-71; Pierre Vallières, *L'Exécution de Pierre Laporte*, éditions quebec/amerique, 1977, pp. 44-45)

During the capture of James Cross, his wife and daughter removed from Montreal to the British Embassy in Switzerland. Cross admitted, finally, that he had earlier worked with British Intelligence ... from time to time. (Devirieux, p. 68).

Police patrols were (amazingly) absent at the time of the kidnap of Pierre Laporte, Deputy (and Acting) Premier of Quebec, five days after the kidnap of James Cross. [Police - in answer to the report of the kidnap of James Cross ... and five days later in answer to the report of the kidnap of Pierre Laporte ... rushed – in both cases - *to wrong addresses*.] Police knew the place to which Pierre Laporte was taken but there is no certainty it was the place, later named: the *famous* 5630 rue Armstrong. Indeed, a Quebec cabinet member (Jerome Choquette) reported Laporte was *not there* after the kidnap, and on October 14 premier Robert Bourassa told Madame Laporte that authorities had found where Laporte was and his release would be a matter of hours. But ... perhaps ... a power higher than the premier of Quebec had other plans [Vallieres, *L'Execution*.... p. 98] Laporte was murdered (somewhere) three days later.[Reporters were allowed – after the events – to visit the scene *reported by police to be the site of the kidnap and murder* (5630 rue Armstrong)]. The reporters couldn't understand why police had used explosives to enter an address they had long had under surveillance and, as well, smashed the place to pieces before allowing the press to see it.]

*The most vexing matter of the whole strange tale of the October Crisis is the role of the five or so people apparently involved in the death of Laporte. Richard Therrien gives almost certain evidence that Jacques Rose and Francis Simard could not have been part of the murder of Laporte. The Duchaine Inquiry cleared Paul Rose. And, yet, the actors themselves admitted guilt in various ways. That brought Vallieres to ask about “guinea pigs”, suggesting even deeper and more disturbing interrelations. (Vallieres, *L'execution*, pp.112-115).*

The autopsy conducted on The Deputy Premier of Quebec, Pierre Laporte, was strangely mishandled by seasoned professionals. It was so unorthodox that one of the presiding doctors refused to sign the Autopsy Reports. Almost no other comment is necessary.

Required to be recorded as undertaken, no recording of the autopsy exists or existed. The two doctors who signed the Autopsy Report changed their version the day after the examination of Laporte's body. They, in fact, took twenty days to reach a final report. The coroner appointed on that last day, judge Jacques Trajan, named Paul and Jacques Rose, Francis Simard, and Bernard Lortie criminally responsible for the death of Pierre Laporte... though the actual place of his death is not known... and his murderers have never been identified for certain.

In 1973 the federal government shifted ... and declared that the death of Pierre Laporte was an accident ... effected unintentionally when he was trying to escape... So no one was guilty of *premeditated* murder in his case. (That declaration may have shortened the time “inside” for those declared guilty of Laporte’s murder.)

Nothing is certain about the death of Pierre Laporte but the apparently intended confusions created by persons in authority. Experts agree that the time of his death should have been determined within about sixty minutes at most: the “experts” appointed could, however, only guess at a possible time over many hours. That made the movement of possible killers unimportant, unnecessary to investigate ... or ... impossible to relate to the murder.

The doctor who refused to sign the Autopsy Reports was asked by *Le Jour* in 1975 about the findings, and he declared that the conclusions of the pathologists seemed to him to have the same worth as the expert findings on ballistics reported after the assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy. That is a murder which has famously had almost *every claim* made by officialdom challenged by researchers and experts. And the death of Kennedy has been explained as a Deep State determination to be rid of the policy views held by the Kennedy family (which explains the murder of Robert Kennedy, too, a little later).

Laporte’s wife and family and friends didn’t believe the official story of Pierre Laporte’s death. They considered the State responsible. Madame Laporte wanted a small, family funeral. Pierre Trudeau took it out of the family’s hands and had a huge (widely reported) State Funeral in Notre Dame Basilica in Montreal ... for ***The Great Canadian Wantonly (the story went) Murdered By The FLQ***. Laporte may have, in fact, been ‘*dealt with*’ by the RCMP, or by the Canadian Military, or ... by someone else

His body was delivered (unchallenged, unnoticed) – a few hundred feet from the Headquarters of the Mobile Command group of the Canadian Army, on federal territory, in full daylight, at a time of high public alert – in a Chevrolet (the kidnap car) whose licence number was known and had been published widely by police as the kidnap car license

In fact, the imposition of the War Measures Act was not pleasing to a large number of Canadians and their Parliamentarians (before the murder of Laporte). Many of them were going to assemble in protest on Parliament Hill. (The organizing telephones were almost certainly tapped by the RCMP: mine was. As was the telephone – for instance – in the parliamentary office of Progressive Conservative MP Erik Neilson, with whom I was speaking).

The protest Demonstration began to loom as an important event. And it is fair to assume the RCMP “listeners” were reporting to certain Cabinet Committees the potential size of the coming Event to be attended by Opposition Party members and their leaders. Across Canada, Canadians were uneasy and unsure ... but open to seeing challenges to the brutal use of State power for political ends. And then ... Pierre Laporte was murdered ... by vicious, mindless, *terrorists*... and all of Canada got behind the War Measures Act. The Parliament Hill protest never happened. Parliamentarians (and others) were disabled by the shock. Support for Pierre Elliott Trudeau sky-rocketed.

Marshall McLuhan’s statement that the October Crisis produced the first electronic revolution is simply untrue – because a succession of shoddy falsehoods and violent actions projected by modern forms of communication have repeatedly misinformed and misled fair-minded populations over the last hundred or so years ... to enable, in fact, “revolutionary” changes in policy.

McLuhan might have said that the October Crisis created the first major response in Canada to a revolution that didn’t exist ... but to say that would have offended his prime ministerial friend engaged in meeting – with the full power of a lawless State – a perfectly legitimate democratic movement.

Public sentiment – which was on the cusp of turning, nationally, against the imposition of the War Measures Act and was on the cusp of placing Pierre Trudeau on the Hot Seat – *turned abruptly*, with the murder of Pierre Laporte, and then stayed warmly in Trudeau’s favour...

WHO (we may fairly ask) killed Pierre Laporte?

ROBIN MATHEWS, VANCOUVER

rmathews@telus.net *

In Dialogue Issue 32-1, Autumn 2018, p.24