

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

on there and whether certain things said in that film were said by them.

I would like to ask the President of the Privy Council, was he there when this film crew was in the cabinet room when certain political matters were being discussed, and when I get an answer from him I will at least know where I stand. I would be willing to withdraw if the Prime Minister feels hurt over these things, if I could get an answer to my question, but I do not want a red herring drawn across the question I asked. I want to get an answer, which is my right.

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. member to withdraw the statement he made, and you have asked him to withdraw. He is now talking about the impression which may have been created in people's minds that this was a meeting of the cabinet. I tell him again, and the house, that I am informed this particular newspaper photograph did not appear in the film at all.

**An hon. Member:** How do you know?

**Mr. Pearson:** I repeat, I am informed that it did not, by those responsible for showing the film. I also repeat that there was no filming of a cabinet meeting at all, and the picture in question was not a picture of a meeting of the cabinet. It was a picture of certain cabinet ministers assembling before a cabinet meeting. There was no filming of any cabinet meeting or any committee of the cabinet, and I repeat that according to my information the particular picture in question did not appear in the film that was shown.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, before an irrevocable decision is made on your part may I refer Your Honour to citation 154 in the fourth edition of *Beauchesne*, paragraph 5, which says:

It is not unparliamentary to say that a statement is untrue, but it is unparliamentary to say that it was untrue to the knowledge of the member addressing the house.

I think this illustrates the wisdom of the decisions laid down under this citation.

**Mr. Hamilton:** One thing finally, Mr. Speaker. I will withdraw my remarks if I can get an answer to the original question I asked the President of the Privy Council, without interference from the Prime Minister and any of his colleagues.

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, before the President of the Privy Council replies I ask you to confirm the ruling you have made.

[Mr. Hamilton.]

According to the hon. member the withdrawal is now made conditional on the President of the Privy Council answering a question. Surely, Mr. Speaker, you have asked for unconditional withdrawal, and it should be given.

**Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber):** Mr. Speaker, I am one of the members of the house who saw that film in its entirety when it was presented by members of the press gallery down at *Crawley Films*. I was there from the beginning until the very end, and I can back up the Prime Minister in every detail of his statement when he states that the picture purporting to be a meeting of the cabinet, the picture that appeared in the newspaper, does not appear in the film from beginning to end. There are one or two pictures purporting to show meetings of committee of the cabinet which occupy a good portion of the film but which I consider the worst piece of motion picture t.v. programming I ever did see. I repeat that the purported picture in the newspaper did not appear in the film; only those two committee meetings.

**Mr. Speaker:** This is certainly not the easiest decision to give especially when the evidence, to my poor legal brain, seems to be somewhat faulty. It seems to me allegations are made this morning on pictures which appear in newspapers and on implications drawn from the seeing of a film. On the one side that is the charge. On the other side you have the total repudiation by the Prime Minister of the country, that there was no meeting of the cabinet at this time.

Inasmuch as the right hon. Prime Minister must have been at that meeting, or at least his colleagues were, I think the benefit of the doubt should be given to the people who were on the spot and not to pictures that may appear in the newspapers or to implications drawn from headings, or otherwise from the viewing of the film. Therefore in view of the complete, absolute and total denial by the Prime Minister of the implication and of the charge, it does seem to me that according to *Beauchesne's* fourth edition, citation 155:

It will be useful to give examples here of expressions which are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference. These may be classified as follows:

1. The imputation of false or unavowed motives.
2. The misrepresentation of the language of another and the accusation of misrepresentation.
3. Charges of uttering a deliberate falsehood—