

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Pearson: One hon. member has seen this film. The hon. member may have seen this film. I have not.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You did.

Mr. Pearson: I have not seen this film.

Mr. Churchill: What have you seen, then?

Mr. Diefenbaker: What did you see, an expurgated edition of an expurgated edition?

Mr. Pearson: If the hon. gentleman will contain his excitement I will finish my statement.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Give us the truth.

Mr. Pearson: The hon. gentleman who says he has seen the film—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Where is the truth squad now?

Mr. Pearson: I know hon. gentlemen do not like the truth. That is why they are interrupting.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): We like the truth. That is what we want.

Mr. Pearson: I ask the hon. member for Port Arthur if he can bring in evidence to confirm that he saw in the film the particular picture in the newspaper, and that there was any picture in the film of a meeting of the cabinet; because there was not.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): How do you know? You never saw it.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the point of order and whether or not I should withdraw, I submit there are two or three small points that may have escaped your notice. One is that yesterday when I asked my original question I pointed out that a certain picture had appeared in a Montreal newspaper. In this picture I recognized certain things and certain people. Then I looked at the question by the hon. member for Royal on Tuesday and at the answer by the Prime Minister, and there was a discrepancy between that answer and the picture which I saw, in which I recognized certain things as a member of parliament and as an ex-member of the cabinet.

The Prime Minister yesterday repeated to me the answer he gave to the hon. member for Royal, and when I thought Your Honour was ruling future questions like this out of order I rose and put in a caveat to the effect that there were serious implications in the answer of the Prime Minister that I would

like to review in the light of fuller evidence which I am in the process of collecting.

I would like to read to you, if I may, the reasonable way I put my question yesterday:

I have in my hand a copy of the *Montreal Gazette* of yesterday which shows what purports to be—

Mr. Pearson: "What purports to be".

Mr. Hamilton:

a still picture from this controversial film. It is labelled "At cabinet. This picture of Prime Minister Pearson addressing the cabinet was taken from the controversial film". I would like to ask the Prime Minister—and I am sure there is a rational explanation for this—whether he could give to the house a more rational explanation of this apparent contradiction, so that unhappy interpretations will not be placed on this apparent difference.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I would have liked yesterday, as a reasonably moderate member of the house, to have the Prime Minister give me the full explanation of what went on. Apparently one of the members of the press went to the Prime Minister's office and got a fuller explanation last night, and it appears in the *Globe and Mail* this morning.

The Prime Minister refused that fuller explanation to me yesterday so today, when I asked a follow up question to get at more of the facts from the President of the Privy Council, whether he was at a meeting in the cabinet room when these people were filming this film called "Mr. Pearson", and whether political matters were being discussed, I would like an answer to that question. On that answer a great deal depends as to whether or not I am willing to withdraw the remarks I have made to the Prime Minister.

Once again I repeat; the third point is that I did not say what the Prime Minister said yesterday was in the narrow sense untrue. I said in my view it was not the complete truth. The Prime Minister says it was the complete and total truth; but the hon. member for Port Arthur, who has seen the film, and on his word as a member of this house, says it left the impression in his mind that this was in the cabinet room and that certain things were being discussed that left the impression with the viewer of that film that this was part of the daily life of a prime minister.

I am suggesting here that when the Prime Minister made that statement yesterday it was not the complete truth. The complete truth can only be found when we see the film, so I am asking certain ministers what went