

protection significantly. For this reason it would be unrealistic to ask for more funds at this point. What is the solution? In the first place, what we already have should be used efficiently. In addition, in my view, we should also be looking for non-traditional ways of supplementing the health-protection budget.

Let us return to the question of health. If an individual makes no effort to protect his own health, or worse, if he harms it (in whatever way), then the question logically arises: should the State bear the material costs of his rehabilitation? He should pay who "spoils the music." This also includes parents, kindergartens, schools, and especially industry. By not providing healthy working conditions for its workers, or by disturbing the ecological balance so that the sick rate is increased, work collectives should be obliged to compensate the state health protection institution for any treatment costs incurred. Among other things, not only will this type of approach strengthen the material base of the health protection system, but it will also create conditions in which the sick rate can be reduced. This must not in any way be understood as a shift towards paid medical care, but merely as a restoration of justice.

It would be unjust not to mention at this point one other problem--the quality of medical aid.

It is no secret that professional ignorance among medical workers results in delays in treatment and deterioration of the patient's health. Only economic levers can rectify the situation.

"He wasted it--let him pay for it out of his own pocket!" With this kind of approach the lazy