

Supply—Health and Welfare

allowances set down in the regulations of the Department of National Health and Welfare. In order to meet these qualifications one almost has to have, as the old saying goes, one foot in the grave and the other on a banana peel because of the way the regulations are interpreted today.

I would ask the minister to find out whether or not something can be done about the regulations in order to bring them more in line with the incapability of these people to work. I know of several cases at this time that are shocking, but whenever I write the minister of public health and welfare of my province I always receive a reply to the effect that the medical review board in interpreting the federal regulations issued by the Department of National Health and Welfare finds it is impossible for the individual concerned to qualify.

In this regard I should like to refer again to the Senate committee report on aging wherein at page 26 the following is stated:

The committee recommends: That the N.E.S. devote greater attention to the field of part time employment with a view to discovering the nature of the demand and offering a more effective placement service.

I suggest that recommendation might apply very well to many of these people now unable to exist on disabled and blind pensions.

● (5:30 p.m.)

During the last election campaign one of the Progressive Conservative party's planks was the elimination of the means test in regard to blind and disabled allowances. Perhaps it was not a significant plank in our platform but it is a plank which indicates the real appreciation this party has for the welfare of the citizens of this nation. It exemplifies the fact that we are willing to produce the kind of program which will meet the needs of the people of this country. It exemplifies our concern for the suffering evident everywhere today in this nation among these people. I hope the minister will give very serious consideration to broadening the regulations so that employability will be a factor as well as disability.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Godin: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) on his appointment to that post and I regret having to draw to his attention certain steps of doubtful value that were taken under his predecessor.

[Mr. Coates.]

It could be that the former minister was not informed of the unwholesome work performed under his department's authority by certain medical doctors who probably wanted to justify their jobs and enhance their prestige before their friends.

In any case, those wretched individuals took advantage of the cow's product to cowardly bring honest citizens before the courts. Some farmers are now charged with having put poor quality milk on the market. I am convinced that to force someone to stand trial, one must be sure that the accused is morally guilty. Therefore, in this case, the person who can honestly prove that the farmer is guilty, as far as the quality of the milk is concerned, is not yet born, for the very good reason that dairy milk is never bought but taken on consignment by the processors concerned. They go to the farmers to take delivery of the milk, they see to it that it is weighed and they only have the right to accept or return that product, and often, the product processed in several ways will be put on the market before the farmers get a penny.

At the present time, the dairy producers in the riding of Champlain are awaiting the verdict following a trial which took place before the courts in Trois-Rivières.

Other farmers in my riding are awaiting their trial which has been set for March in Quebec City. It is through the R.C.M.P. that they learned that they had put milk of poor quality on the market on May 4, 1965. The farmers, who normally sell their milk \$5.50 per cwt. get from their dairy a first, second and third notice when such a thing happens. Sometimes the farmers must stop delivering milk for a week or two, that is long enough to enable them to locate the trouble. But there is never any talk of a trial. However, in the case under consideration, that is dairy milk, for which the farmers get only \$3 per cwt. when it costs them \$3.50, there was not any first, second or third notice.

And what is most ridiculous about this situation, Mr. Chairman, is that the processor never stopped getting milk from those farmers.

I have here the quantities supplied by a producer for each day in 1965. They total 63,669 pounds. Either his product was good or it was not. If it was, the dairy did well to accept it. But if it was not, it might have been due to the herd which should have been killed. But it might have been due also to the refrigeration method. If the milk was considered unsuitable for making some products,