

Return tabled.

AIR CANADA UTILIZATION OF AIRCRAFT COMPARED TO  
OTHER AIRLINES

Question No. 2,633—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. What is the average daily utilization in hours of the (a) Boeing 747 (b) Boeing 727 (c) Douglas DC8 (d) Douglas DC9 (e) Lockheed-L1011 operated by Air Canada as at December 31, 1974?

2. For the same period, what are the comparative figures for the same or similar type aircraft operated by (a) CP Air (b) Delta Airlines (c) Northwest Airlines (d) Braniff Airlines (e) Pan American Airlines (f) Western Airlines (g) Eastern Airlines (h) American Airlines?

Return tabled.

● (1530)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### THE BUDGET

#### FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed, from Wednesday, June 25, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government; the amendment thereto of Mr. Stevens (p. 7063) and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Broadbent (p. 7067).

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) is not able to be in the House this afternoon. I say this not to make any protest about it, because I accept the fact that he cannot be here, but simply to express regret that he cannot have the benefit of my advice to him delivered personally, thereby missing some of the nuances and emphasis that will never come across properly in *Hansard*.

This is my fifth opportunity to comment on a budget presented by the current Minister of Finance. I am quite sure the minister would have been just as happy to have escaped to some other jurisdiction after his fourth effort. I got that impression when the budget he delivered last November covered a time-frame not just of a year but of a year and a half. However, his departure to other fields was not to be the case, and here we are again. To say that the minister has made a downhill progression in the worth of his budgets from the first to the fifth would be about the same as saying that the *Titanic* was ill-designed to be a submarine.

I remember some of those earlier budgets that contained dramatic innovations like indexing of the personal income tax system which the minister had earlier said would create chaos and imperil federal-provincial fiscal relations. The minister was certainly right about what we were going to have—chaos and strain. I do not know why he did that crazy indexing when he had so accurately forecast what was going to happen. It is a shame that happened to be his last correct forecast.

*The Budget—Mr. Stanfield*

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** Then there were the tax cuts and pension increases as well, early in 1973, following the near defeat of the government in 1972. In respect of those tax cuts and pension increases the minister had earlier forecast they would lead us to ruin and ultimately to bankruptcy. The minister was quite right in his forecasts in those good old days. Then the minister began to slip. There were little errors at first—errors of the order of 50 per cent and 60 per cent, and then bigger ones like predicting 4 per cent growth for a year in which there was no growth at all.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Stanfield:** Finally, it just had to happen; we got a budget with no forecast whatsoever. Some might say that the minister lost his nerve, but I find that very hard to believe. I am more inclined to believe that the minister was faced with a desperate dilemma and there was only one thing he could do. Just look at it this way: if you had forecast chaos, strain and ruin if certain things were done, and then you did those things and, sure enough, along came chaos, strain and ruin right on schedule, what do you do for an encore?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** Obviously and logically—at least logically in the government's method of thinking—if the country is to be spared total collapse, when you are in the position of the Minister of Finance in these circumstances you must stop forecasting anything and stop doing anything. And the minister has met these requirements in this new budget.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** You will recall, sir, that at the time of his November budget last year the minister said he was on a tight-rope, figuratively speaking. When he committed himself to a new budget in the wake of a spate of sabre-rattling and doom-saying in terms of both himself and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), he raised a host of expectations that the government might finally take some definitive action to deal with the economic problems of this country. The kites and the trial balloons were flown, but all these came crashing down last Monday night, along with the hopes of millions of ordinary Canadians who look to this government to protect their interests. Everything fell in a heap—everything but the poor minister who was left hanging by one hand, dangling from his November tight-rope. I hope the Prime Minister has sent him a copy of his office poster which says "Hang in There, Baby!"

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** It is almost impossible for even the most dedicated apologist for this government to impute any thrust or direction to this latest budget. The posture of many of the ad hoc items presented was not a chosen posture but, rather, a posture that was forced upon the government. That, sir, is not leadership, that is drifting: it is like the command going down from the bridge to the engine-room, "Hold her unsteady as she goes".

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!