

pany, I got in touch with members of the Prices and Incomes Commission to let them know about the steady and uncontrollable increase of coal and the control the companies have on that product.

I therefore wrote to the Prices and Incomes Commission asking for action, as increases are in fact about 10 per cent every time, which is tremendous.

Well, here is the answer from the Prices and Incomes Commission dated April 30th 1970 to a request made on March 23rd.

On March 23rd, the price of coal had gone up 10 per cent per ton. We therefore lodged a complaint and received from the Prices and Incomes Commission the following reply, and I quote:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 14th in which you inform us of the recent increase in the price of smelting coke.

We called your office on April 21st to let you know that we were preparing our reply. Lasalle, the supplier, has informed the Commission that the increase in price of \$5 per ton as of April 1st 1970 was due to recent advances in the cost of raw materials.

To our knowledge, the Lasalle Co. purchases large quantities of coal in the United States. Coal prices have increased by as much as 44 per cent, without taking into account tariff rises on goods in the United States.

Considering that one ton of coal produces only half a ton of coke, it is obvious that the increase in price by Lasalle will barely cover the cost of the coal.

Lasalle's production costs, labour included, have also gone up considerably. Furthermore, the price of coal may rise again later in the year when the miners receive the last increase provided for in their present agreement.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the Lasalle Co. that said that the price would rise again, it is the Prices and Incomes Commission. And that was said on April 30, at which time there had been a 10 per cent rise in the price of a ton of coal. With the blessing of the Prices and Incomes Commission, the Lasalle Co., once again, on September 29, announces another increase in the price of coal of about 10 per cent, thus bringing the price to \$55.25 a ton. This means that in 1966, it was \$38.25 and \$55.25 in 1970.

I sent a copy of this answer to the Fonderie Sainte-Croix as a proof of the steps we had taken. They evidently protested and rightly so.

If the government cannot control this increase, if the Prices and Incomes Commission can only consider without making any suggestion, without proposing any solution, this means that the fight against inflation by the government is only a joke. In fact, it would have been possible to tell the coke company that a 30 per cent increase per year on the price of a ton of coal was too much.

As a result, the prices of products manufactured by La Fonderie Sainte-Croix, which employs 135 workmen, are increasing at a galloping rate.

That is why I say that the fight against inflation, in the light of experience acquired in our respective districts, is a monumental hoax and that the government cannot disprove it. Let us take as an example La Fonderie Sainte-Croix, which must submit to the increases of The

The Address—Mr. Fortin

Lasalle Coke Company, which in turn will probably have to increase its costs some day.

In reply to a question put by an hon. member, the Prices and Incomes Commission could give no better explanation of the situation than a statement to the effect that they hope there will be no further increase or, at least, that they do not anticipate any.

Mr. Speaker, the *Ralliement créditiste* moves an amendment in order to remind the government that in raising the spectre of inflation, it succeeds at the most in making our people believe that they can be destroyed by it. What a laugh, as inflation is being fought on the back of Canadian taxpayers, especially the little people.

Therefore, we want to remind the government that family allowances, in particular, have not been raised for quite a while, being still at \$6 and \$8 per month, which is ridiculous, considering that the government approves increases in production of 30% per year for a single company.

Mr. Speaker, if the government can allow private enterprises to keep on increasing their prices in such a way, thus raising the cost of living, it should realize that, on the other hand, the people of Canada cannot live on peanuts, that children cannot be fed with prayers. The rate of unemployment and the lack of income for these people are well known. The authorities should once and for all acknowledge that these people need financial support from the government to fight inflation in their own right and to cope with the cost of living increases backed up by the government.

Those are the reasons why, Mr. Speaker, by way of this sub-amendment, we assert that the Speech from the Throne does not forecast any positive or forthcoming action to revise family allowances and we want to urge the hon. members and ministers to ponder over the issue and to submit a bill during this session to increase family allowances, because we still claim that the basic unit in Canada is the family. It is high time for the government to take a concrete step to encourage the raising of families instead of discouraging it as it is doing now with all kinds of measures.

The basic unity, the family, is still the best guardian of our values, of our traditions and of order in Canada. This government, by measures such as those on abortion or the fight against inflation, which end up by increasing unemployment, are depriving family heads from their means of living, etc.

If a student is unable to obtain a scholarship or to find work, his father is obliged to go into debt. The mother is often compelled to borrow money to buy food for the family. If the father cannot afford a car to drive to his place of work, he must borrow. Then, the basic unity in Canada is no longer the family but the finance company.

It is high time that the government takes sides with the citizens and not with the companies. It has to take sides with the human person and not with the finance companies so that at last man can find his place within this system. Indeed, money has to be in man's service. Man has not always to creep before money.