

Employment

only in this way can they stabilize their production and advance their technology. They make a very good product; the city of Sydney is very heavily dependent on the company, and it would not require any great amount of money to carry out this policy option, just a directive. Hawker Siddeley, which is close, economically and geographically, is to some extent dependent on Sydney Steel. It has a virtual monopoly on the production of railway axles in this country. This particular industry requires upgrading and there has to be some sort of incentive or assistance given to secure its future. Again, it employs nearly 2,000 people and makes Trenton, Nova Scotia, practically a one-industry town. The government can very easily assure the future of these jobs, not by spending a lot of money but by offering incentives and changing its industrial strategy.

Another industry in Nova Scotia, one which represents the opposite extreme, a new and modern industry which has placed Nova Scotia at the forefront of rubber technology, is Michelin Tire. This industry is suffering from the existing import duties and is being hit by countervailing duties on the other hand, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is something that the government can change and which will not require spending nor much loss of revenue, because this tire company has made it very clear that, in the process of rationalizing the Canadian rubber industry, they are prepared to take on all comers and perhaps encourage a healthy competitive expansion of some of their competitors if they want to take advantage of the more advantageous conditions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the absence of job-creation programs that really count is one of the problems that we as politicians have to face. The minister responsible for these programs certainly means well. He is putting together programs, but they have no real significance in the long term, and he knows that. The term band-aid has been used ad nauseam, but there is some truth to it when it comes to lasting worth and real production gains. It is really a temporary solution. There is something to be said, I think, for looking at management techniques that we find in the industries in which government participates.

Now let me talk about transportation for a moment. Politicians have said from time to time, various ministers of regional economic expansion and other politicians, including the Prime Minister, that, yes indeed, transportation is certainly a key component in regional development and the creation of jobs, obviously. Well, we have seen recently in Atlantic Canada that our transportation rail network has been curtailed. There is no doubt about that. But I am looking right now at the executive structure of the CNR. When Air Canada had very capable financial and aeronautical expertise, it did well as a Crown corporation. Then, as we know, a few years ago we had a corporation lawyer, Yves Pratt, put in a key executive position, and the airline did very badly. The management and the act were changed and Air Canada is doing very well today.

• (2120)

CN is now going through a similar phase which could be key to the success of jobs and industry. Mr. Bandeem has gone. Some say that he did not leave but was pushed. Some say that he was fired because of some of the deals he had proposed, such as the acquisition of Cast, which was rejected by the board; and the bus company that he purchased in Quebec without bothering to tell some of his directors did not go over too well. Perhaps his previous threats of resignation for a better job in the United States did not wash. Anyway, he is gone, for whatever reason.

Therefore, I am getting a sense of *déjà vu*. I am wondering if we will get one of our former colleagues, Jack Horner or Otto Lang in CN either as chairman or president.

An hon. Member: Heaven forbid!

Mr. MacKay: Maybe we will see Dr. Leclaire, a former mandarin, put into the post that Pratt, occupied in Air Canada! Maybe we will be reading "Horner for Mackasey". I recall now the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey) was put in at one point to look after Air Canada, or maybe we will be reading "Leclaire for Pratt". I hope not, because this Crown corporation is too important to be managed by failed politicians. Surely the welfare of the CN and of our great transport network, which, in turn, is so important to our economy, will be held more important than to be used as a repository for people who, while they may be very capable in their own right, have no business running a large, complex corporation which requires special expertise.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacKay: Let us then look at some of the key industries which this government has manipulated or tried to help. We will give the government the benefit of the doubt. Maybe it meant well however. Let us look at de Havilland and Canadair. Let us look at the debacle which is shaping up there. I have had questions on the Order Paper since last November asking some very simple questions about Canadair, such as, "How many planes have been delivered? What was the cost? What are the projections? When will we ever have a break-even point?"

The situation is very bad, and everyone knows that, but no one wants to talk about it. Massey-Ferguson is another great Canadian multinational. However, the problem is that despite all the money put in to create jobs, very few of the jobs, comparatively speaking, are in Canada and, as a matter of interest, since we have been discussing economic nationalism from time to time, and have been justifying our national energy policy with it, to the detriment of our whole economy in jobs. The United States does not take kindly to what this government is doing, and they are going one way and we are going another, and we have also thrown metrication in to further complicate it. I used to think that freedom to measure was a measure of freedom, but now we are being prosecuted for using imperial measurements.