

whole, he would have said: It is too little, too late, or something like that. One way or the other, I understand his position as a member of the opposition party, and I hope he will understand mine as a government member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may well admit—

**Mr. Davis Lewis (York South):** He could answer yes.

**Mr. Loiselle:** No, he cannot say "yes" when it is not "yes".

**Mr. Lewis:** The minister could answer "yes".

**Mr. Loiselle:** Yes, and what argument would the member then bring up?

Mr. Speaker, the member will surely remember that it was the Liberal party that decided to lower from 70 to 65 the age of eligibility for the old age pension.

And so, next year, from the 1st of January, that is in five months, every Canadian citizen of 65 or more will be eligible to the old age pension; that will cost the government an additional \$600 million a year.

The old age security pension now costs, according to the budget for 1969-70, \$1,500 million. In 1970-71, it will cost \$1,620 million.

With regard to the guaranteed income supplement, according to the budget for 1969-70, it will cost the federal government \$269 million more, and in 1970-71, \$286 million.

However, the 2 per cent increase, for 1969-70, which is taken into account in the figures quoted a while ago—

• (10:10 p.m.)

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the parliamentary secretary, but his time has expired.

[Translation]

AGRICULTURE—QUEBEC—NET INCOME OF INDUSTRIAL MILK PRODUCERS

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to point out to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) the general displeasure of the manufactured milk producers whose income is decreasing as a result of the government dairy policy for the year 1969-70.

There is a tendency at times to blame the farmers for many things. Still, in 1966, the government itself was concerned about the

### *Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

decrease in dairy production. Indeed, the then Minister of Agriculture stated, on March 23, 1966, and I quote:

Unless the producer's confidence in his ability to make a decent living from dairy farming is restored, we face the prospect of shortages.

And so, a policy was adopted to encourage the farmers to increase their production, to enlarge their farms with a view to making their operations more profitable, and to provide the dairy production that is necessary for Canadian consumption.

The same day the former Minister of Agriculture said that the main cause which induced the government to act was the great number of dairy producers who were abandoning this industry in order to raise pigs and cattle. He said also that he was concerned with the fact that a great number of dairy producers had given up agriculture so that Canada was facing the possibility of a great shortage of dairy products necessary for national consumption.

He also said that we needed productive and adequate lands and that measures had been taken to this end through the Farm Credit Corporation and through ARDA. The present minister said this: I do not see how we will help the farmers by giving them more credit, by helping them to get into debt, unless we get more involved in marketing and particularly by giving more protection to our producers.

Now, on March 31, 1969, the Minister of Agriculture announced a new dairy policy. According to this policy there was a reduction of the quota price. I am not prepared to blame the whole policy but I am opposed to the established price and to the export tax.

Let us remember that in 1967 a march on Ottawa was organized by the farmers. At that time the Minister of Agriculture came to meet them in front of the parliament buildings. I was among them and the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development (Mr. Sauvé) told us that we were right to make claims, that we should have organized our march on Ottawa ten years before and that we had been very patient.

Therefore, once again we had hoped that the government would establish a long term dairy policy, that prices would get stabilized and that with an effort, we would finally succeed in solving the problem.

In 1968, which was an election year, the government which was then a minority government decided to raise the subsidy to \$1.31.