renowned and honourable gentleman from the other place known generally as the Rainmaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: The trademark is unmistakable. You rant and you roar, and you hope in the course of saying enough, yelling enough and saying outlandish things, that something will turn up. Under the guidance of his recycled strategist, the Prime Minister launches off attacking other parties on their divisions, as he calls them, and he tries to create the impression that his own party is just one complete blissful unit.

Some hon. Members: Oh. oh!

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, it is all right for the Minister of Finance to dissociate himself from the so-called anti-profiteering bill; it is all right for the Prime Minister's entire loyal band of colleagues to leave the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Gray) more alone in this House than anybody has ever been in Trois-Rivières.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Not as alone as you.

Mr. Stanfield: Those are just differences of opinion. The pristine unity of the cabinet is obvious. Any fool can see that. Then there is the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson). If he wants to keep up his long-standing discussions about a new political party, a party which would involve a couple of former Liberal members who have sat for hours with him talking about this scheme, that is not division, Mr. Speaker; that is just the minister exercising his prerogative to examine all the options that might be available to him. And, of course, when the same minister threatens to resign over a politically sensitive matter, that is just good, old-fashioned spunk.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Programmed with this rather rose-coloured strategy, the Prime Minister sees unity all around him in his own party. I would not presume to question the wisdom of the honourable senator in the other place. His record speaks for itself. But it strikes me that such an exhibition of self-delusion by the Prime Minister might just strike the electorate as ample reason in itself to extend him a merciful medical discharge.

Sir, there is one matter relating to my party that I do want to speak to, and I think this is the proper place for me to do it. I am referring to the very regrettable reference made to the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) by Senator Gratton O'Leary on television last Sunday. I not only dissociate myself and my party from that kind of remark, but I take this occasion to restate our debt to the right hon. gentleman for the great service he has rendered to the country, to parliament and to our party.

The Budget—Mr. Stanfield

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1650

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, the House leader seems to be upset this afternoon, and I am sorry. I want to say that when I was in provincial politics, and again in federal politics, I always received a lot of help from the government House leader and I do not want to seem unappreciative. I do want to pay tribute to the continuing contributions of the right hon. gentleman to the country, to parliament and to our party. I want to thank him for it and say long may he be active in this parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: My reference to a medical discharge was in relation to the Prime Minister, and certainly not in relation to the right hon. gentleman. Canadians can look at the Prime Minister's remarks last night and see very clear signs of a failing memory. He moaned about all the latest legislation that would die on the order paper with dissolution.

Mr. Trudeau: Not all.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I think it is only an act of common decency to plug one significant gap in the right hon. gentleman's memory—the Prime Minister's—in an effort to assure him that the country really will survive. When the Prime Minister sought dissolution of the twenty-eighth parliament, an act which only he could undertake and which he did undertake, the order paper was filled to overflowing—and filled notably, though the Prime Minister and all his advisers evidently forgot about it—with government legislation required to implement a budget which had been presented over four months earlier. To say that the Prime Minister forgot that is the kindest way I can put it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Danforth: Selective amnesia.

Mr. Trudeau: A better knowledge of the rules, that's all.

Mr. Stanfield: How much better to do what we are doing now. Rather than wait for four months, how much better to do it now and spare the country another experience of an additional four months of uncertainty in government. Now that I have checked the Prime Minister's memory a little about all the financial measures he left on the order paper at the time he dissolved parliament the last time, I hope he will feel a little less disconsolate about what parliament is going to do later this afternoon.

I want to believe that the Prime Minister really meant what he said last night. I have worked at this. I really want to believe that the Prime Minister was making last night, as he said he was, a sincere and non-partisan analysis. But he simply forgot what he did himself in 1972. With his well known respect for parliament and the democratic process it is surely unthinkable that he was chastising parliament about election expenses legislation, foreign investment legislation and competition legislation.