

the public such as myself would be unable to judge it. But I think it is important that a great deal more research be done, perhaps by consumer associations, perhaps by groups concerned with pollution and environment or by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, to evaluate the various products we use.

I said a moment ago that some gasolines have a much higher lead content than others. I have before me a publication which indicates that this is something of a fraud on the public and that advertisements stating that low lead gasolines reduce pollution may not be as honest as they should be and are perhaps inaccurate. A company in Canada embarked upon a major advertising campaign, saying that they could produce a low lead gasoline. Nevertheless, they are not doing so because it is a fraud on the public in that this gasoline does not reduce pollution; the aromatics which would have to be added to replace lead are worse pollutants.

This type of thing makes me cautious with regard to the hon. member's bill. I think we must have more testing by specialists who would inform us of the over-all effect of a product such as this. While it may be helpful for us to know the octane rating of gasoline, perhaps the performance of the car is affected more by aromatics and other additives than by octane. While bills such as this may be good in achieving their objective—and I support the bill—nevertheless they will not do enough.

I have no wish to talk out this bill. It is one that I think all members of the House will be happy to support. I merely wish to put on the record my reservations regarding a too simplistic type of information which might indeed lead members of the public into making mistakes because of lack of knowledge of the effects of gasoline.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I take part in the debate this afternoon only because I am interested in one aspect that other hon. members have mentioned on previous occasions, that is, the use of different types of fuel in aircraft. It is evidently the case that less inflammable and less dangerous fuel is used on VIP flights than is used on airplanes which have as their main purpose the transportation of the general public. This fact is just brought to my mind. I intended to ask a question about it in the House. I mention it in this debate, and if anybody in the chamber knows anything about the subject I would appreciate a reply. In the *Ottawa Citizen* of December 5, just a few days ago, K. O. Bardwell of Ottawa, whom I understand is knowledgeable on this subject and is a technical civil servant, had published a letter on the labelling of gas as follows:

● (4:10 p.m.)

In the early days of jet airliners, Lord Brabazon of Tara, air pioneer and safety advocate, warned that planes using JP-4 fuel could easily become flying torches. The airlines who are concerned with costs have ignored his warning but British and American VIP flights use safer fuels.

If this fuel is not safe enough in planes transporting royalty and VIP's abroad, it isn't safe enough for public carriers either.

National Trade Mark and True Labelling Act

I believe this matter has been raised in earlier questions. It is an important subject. I agree with the contention of this letter writer, that what is good for VIPs, whether they be in Canada or elsewhere, should be good for the general public. I hope that this measure sponsored by the acting, but yet not quite permanent, government whip—and we hope that his appointment is confirmed—will bring about a greater appreciation of the necessity for having the same type of fuel used in all planes, no matter what passengers they carry. This may not be quite pertinent in terms of the bill, but I would like information on whether VIPs who fly in Canada—some of them may even be in this House—are getting special treatment, because through the years I have advocated that what is good enough for frontbenchers is good enough for backbenchers. This principle applies to every conceivable type of benefit brought into this House, whether it be today, next week or next Christmas.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to intervene for just a moment in this debate because I think the hon. member has brought to the House a measure very well worth referring to the finance committee. I suspect that there may be some problems to be discussed with the law officers of the Crown in terms of the constitutional right of the federal government to do what he proposes, but this does not detract from the fact that the idea of the bill is excellent.

I think, also, that companies which market petroleum products will appreciate the opportunity to come before the committee and give their views on the bill. I see no earthly reason why they should object to complying with such a requirement, because the terminology you see on fuel pumps today, "regular" and "premium", does not mean very much, except that one costs more than the other to the average consumer. If there is indeed anything in octane ratings, the public has a right to have it explained.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, about a year ago there were a couple of price increases. The price of nickel was increased by about 24.3 per cent, and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) characterized the increase as quite small, an idea related no doubt to the fact that 96 per cent of our nickel was marketed outside Canada and so the price increase did not have much domestic impact. At the same time there was a boost in gasoline prices at the pumps in Ontario—seven-tenths of one cent per gallon. There was a great hue and cry about that increase, although it only added about \$3.50 a year to the motoring costs of the average Ontario automobile operator.

The price of mailing a first-class letter was jumped about 1 cent just about a year ago. That was an increase of 20 per cent. At that time I do not recall anybody demanding an investigation of the Post Office for the purpose of determining whether the cost increase was justified. The Post Office had simply found its operating costs had risen and that, if it was to operate in a prudent business fashion, it had to collect more money