while this minister may place one interpretation on the act, another minister may take a different view. I think the minister has a tremendous amount of power in influencing his cabinet colleagues with regard to an acquition of that nature. The present wording of clause 6(1) is as follows:

The corporation may—

(b) buy, sell, lease, construct or otherwise acquire, dispose of and maintain and operate as necessary or incidental to the operation of the corporation's business, aircraft, hotels and other accommodation, surface vehicles and facilities for the transportation and housing of persons, goods and mail;—

I want to draw attention to the words "corporation's business". I think that under the existing act the definition of "corporation's business" is vague, misleading and open to interpretation. What we are really concerned about is that when we refer to air freight we know there is designated air freight which never sees the inside of an aeroplane. The concern here is that under the present loose wording of the act, Air Canada should very easily engage in the utilization of trucks on intercity routes presently served by air freight on the basis that it is incidental to the over-all operations of the corporation's business on a national basis.

● (1230)

The amendment which we have proposed would only serve to confirm the assurances the minister has given in this House and in committee that Air Canada's involvement in the trucking industry will be limited to that which is necessary or incidental to the operation of the corporation's business. I reiterate that the assurance which has been given by the minister should be enshrined and clearly stated in the legislation. Suspicions that if this amendment is rejected, Air Canada would encroach, are based upon statements made by Mr. Taylor to the effect that he sees a very bright future for the movement of air freight, but he is very careful to designate whether that freight will be moving by aircraft or by truck.

We have absolutely no objection to Air Canada's engaging in the movement of highly-valued freight and delivering it by truck as part and parcel of its air cargo service, but to allow Air Canada to engage in intercity trucking and for-hire operations is something to which I object. As a Crown corporation created by parliament to fulfil a particular purpose, to be in a position to opt out of that prime responsibility with facility when faced with competition, in a sense Air Canada is picking the taxpayers' pockets and buying up competition from another mode in order to engage in a business for which Air Canada was not, clearly, given a specific mandate by parliament.

When a Crown corporation determines that its economic well-being requires encroachment into an area outside the scope of its enabling legislation, the matter is first broached with Transport Canada officials who are responsible for air administration on a day to day basis, and support from this source, nine times out of ten, is tantamount to approval in principle in accordance with clause 6(4) which says, "The corporation shall not, without the authorization, by order, of the Government in Council." Then it goes on to outline the number of areas in which the corporation is governed in terms of the authority granted to it by order in council.

What bothers us further is what we will see developing in the transportation industry over the next decade. Rapidly rising costs may affect one mode to a greater extent than another, and where service characteristics are similar, such as they are between air and truck in many cases, the lower cost mode may become overwhelmingly attractive. If increases in fuel costs should have a greater impact on the air mode than on the trucking mode, possibly trucking will acquire a significantly greater cost advantage over air freight than at present. The tendency of a Crown corporation, like any company, is to move into new and more attractive fields rather than to wither away. The CN is a clear example of that. The difference is that a Crown corporation does not face the same financial constraints as private enterprise, regardless of any limitation to its mandate. In my view, Air Canada should not have the facility to involve the federal government further by way of direct investment in for-hire trucking in order to stay in the freight business. As a minimum, something more than the presently contemplated review procedure in clause 6(4) should be contained in this legislation. That is really the thrust of my second motion, failing the adoption of motion No. 1. As a minimum it seems logical that an effective review procedure should be inserted in the bill to provide sufficient notice for any intended acquisitions of existing trucking firms or the creation of new ones.

What is even more distressing to the largely private trucking industry are the implications of clause 6(2) when combined with the principal thrust of Bill C-33, the new National Transportation Act. Particularly, section 3(1) and section 3(2) of that act give the minister very broad discretionary powers to the point of almost dictating what mode of service shall be used to ship a given item to a given point. That kind of unorthodox power is frightening. For example, the minister can inquire into the relationship between the various modes of transport within, to and from Canada. The minister can undertake measures to achieve co-ordination in the operation, development, regulation and control of those various modes of transport. That is provided in section 3(3)(b). Section 3(1)(c) provides:

—and it is further declared that achievement of the objective of the transport policy for Canada requires the integration of services employing the most appropriate modes for each service and that it is the responsibility of governments to attend to the provision of the transportation system.

Those are very broad powers in terms of intermodal integration. Under the provisions of the National Transportation Act which are contemplated, the minister will be able to issue directions to the Canadian Transport Commission, which is the regulatory body, so we really have a nullification of the Canadian Transport Commission under the provisions of Bill C-33. To me, that is overkill in the strongest and strangest sense that I have ever seen in this House. If, in fact, the governor in council should approve a trucking acquisition, this would have the effect of section 27 of the National Transportation Act, which provides for a review procedure, being redundant, thus giving the affected truckers no avenue for an