enforced and, more importantly, must be seen to be enforced as vigorously on the price side as on the wage side. These speeches were brought to the attention of members of the House and the Senate. With regard to the appeal procedure, I said that the law did not give all parties affected by decisions of the Anti-Inflation Board with regard to wages either an automatic or an equal right to make use of the limited appeal procedure already existing.

Under the law as it presently is, to have reviewed a ruling of the board the party must, in effect, openly defy the law, risking a penalty for this, and when it comes to a ruling on wages that party has to be the employer. As I have said previously, I believe such an approach has been hampering the creation of a climate for voluntary acceptance on the part of labour of the guidelines on wages and the board's rulings about them. I have argued that if there are automatic rights of appeal in our legal system for matters as trivial as fines for parking tickets, then there should be rights under something as important as the anti-inflation program for labour as fully as for management.

It has been found that the Anti-Inflation Act, in its original form, froze employees out of the appeal process entirely if the company simply accepted an Anti-Inflation Board ruling and refused to pay any wage settlement not in conformity with it. In such a case, there is no way, under the present law for employees, even though their interests are vitally affected by that ruling, to have the matter reviewed by getting it before the administrator and having the right to further reviews by the appeal tribunal or the cabinet.

I have argued that if such rights could not be set up through changes in the policy of administration of the act, the government should ask parliament to make the necessary amendments to it as soon as possible. This is what it is doing, and this step is necessary to remove the sense of injustice many workers may feel when they look at the present procedure for having board decisions on wages reviewed. However, in order that there may be an automatic right of appeal for labour no less than for management, I think it should be a condition that both sides must abide by the ruling in question during the time it takes to dispose of the appeal. This is needed in order to ensure that the system does not break down if there should turn out to be a large number of appeals. However, I think that sound administration of the program at the board level, together with a more fair appeal procedure, will in fact mean the number of appeals will not be unduly high.

The amendments proposed in Bill C-89 remove the difficulties in the appeal process which I have outlined. They are welcome, and I believe the government should be commended for presenting them so that any injustice connected with the present appeal system would not undermine the high degree of public support for the program which is so necessary for its success.

There is, however, one aspect of the appeal process with which Bill C-89 does not deal. I should like to ask, what if a company increases some, or all, of its prices? What if the board rules that these price increases do not exceed the guidelines? What if the board does not give a formal ruling, but simply advises the company informally that it does not object to the increases in question? Neither the Anti-Inflation Act, Bill C-73 nor Bill C-89 provide any recourse to the consumer who does not agree with this kind of advice or ruling on the part of the Anti-Inflation Board and who wishes to have the matter reviewed at a higher level.

● (1530)

I think, therefore, there should be some procedure for bodies like the Consumers' Association, the National Anti-Poverty Association, the Canadian Labour Congress, or even individual consumers, to appeal a decision or opinion of the board accepting a price increase. At present, if a company does not agree with the ruling of the board that a price is to be rolled back or not increased, it has the right to have the matter appealed, first to the administrator, then the appeal tribunal, and even to the cabinet. There is no equivalent right for a consumer who does not agree with a price increase allowed or agreed to by the board. I think consideration should be given to creating this kind of right. This is something we should pursue when the bill is before the finance committee for detailed study.

As I said previously in the speeches I have mentioned that the program will work most effectively if it has wide public support and understanding. This means the program must be enforced and, more important, must be seen to be enforced as vigorously on the price side as on the wage side. To do this, the board must publicize its findings and conclusions on prices as fully as it presently does on wages. I said that if the act has to be amended for this purpose, the government should ask parliament to take this step without further delay.

However, it has been my belief that the board can do more to make the public aware of the results of its work on the price side even with the act continuing in its present form. You will recall that recently I raised with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), here in the House of Commons, the need for more formal decisions by the board on prices and the need to make them available to the public. He replied that he would be discussing these points with the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board.

Last Saturday, the Canadian Press reported that "stung by criticism of its failure to control prices, the Anti-Inflation Board plans to make public a list of companies that have agreed to reduce planned price increases after talks with the board." This announcement is welcome. It is a wise departure by the board from its original policy, which appeared to be that if a company would make price reductions voluntarily, accepting the board's informal advice, the board would likely not think it necessary to make a formal ruling which the law allows it to publish. However, the Canadian Press report in question also went on to say that "late this week the board was still contacting the companies to get their permission for the public statement expected about Thursday."

In my view, the firms in question should be identified, whether or not they give their permission. The act permits the board to publish its formal rulings, and if the board simply states, as a formal ruling, the advice it gives to a company on price rollbacks, then that ruling, including the company's name, can in fact be published. This is so even if