

pay them. At present we have nurses serving communities and their charges are just about the same as the charges that doctors impose. How is the minister going to get around that? Apparently the minister looks quite surprised at what I am saying. I will give him facts and figures.

Members of the government say they are helping the poor. How are they helping them? I want to talk about the chronically ill, and they are not all old people. Some have had paralytic strokes at age 50. I saw a fellow the other day who was a cripple and he was no older than the minister. These people have to go to hospitals for the chronically ill and to nursing homes, and they are charged a \$3.50 a day deterrent fee.

What a magnanimous government we have in this country. These people need nursing care, medicine and doctors. They are the very people for whom services should be provided free. Let us not boast that we are helping the poor. I could tell the minister about a dozen places where the poor are not helped, where the poor and the sick lie silent, and nobody talks about them. I know the minister will say that these things are within the jurisdiction of the provinces, but the government introduced national medicare and has a responsibility to see that it works effectively.

**Mr. Munro:** Were you for it when we introduced it?

• (1440)

**Mr. Rynard:** Mr. Speaker, the minister asked me if I was for that. I want to tell him that I was. I also want to tell him that I mentioned the 30 per cent of doctors' bills that they were having trouble with and asked that this be covered. If that had been done, we would not be in this mess today. The government does not know whether or not it is going broke, but it is not providing the doctors or the service.

**Mr. Munro:** Talk to Premier Davis!

**Mr. Rynard:** The other day the minister spoke about services and so forth, but services are not being provided. Why are the universities not open during the summer in order to train the doctors that are needed? The minister speaks of pre-examinations and clinical check-ups to keep people out of hospital—

**Mr. Munro:** Talk to Premier Davis; he is in charge of education.

**Mr. Rynard:** This government introduced medicare, and it is their responsibility to talk to the provincial premiers. Mr. Speaker, I will go with the minister and talk to the premier anytime he says.

**Mr. Munro:** I might take you up on that.

**Mr. Rynard:** I will be glad to go, because I feel very keenly about this. The minister said that he wanted to practice more preventive medicine but, Mr. Speaker, there are not enough doctors to look after the sick, so where are we going to get doctors to practise preventive medicine? The minister spoke of setting up a clinic but what an impossible situation that is. Now, we are coming

### *Family Income Security Plan*

into the summer holidays and the universities could be running summer semesters for medical students. This plan would not cost anything because the cost would be recovered in income tax paid by the students as soon as they begin to practice. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a well accepted principle that there is a tendency for families with a large number of children to have lower incomes. I think it is also reasonably well accepted that family allowances do not encourage couples to have children. There is no doubt about this, since studies have shown that family allowances are not an incentive to increasing the birth rate.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Willard, Deputy Minister of National Health and Welfare, cites as a major error the use of gross income rather than net income in establishing cut-off levels, and says that while there is evidence of the role of family allowances in reducing poverty, it is flimsy and incomplete. It is a pretty weak crutch on which to lean. I believe it is only fair to say that family allowances, as suggested in Bill C-170, will play only a very small role in reducing poverty. There have been many sociologists who have stated outright that this bill will do little to combat poverty. Perhaps we could add that it will do a little levelling between the rich and the poor but the crux of the whole problem is to provide greater opportunities, more work and more jobs for more Canadians so that they can look after themselves.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rynard:** The very fact that these larger family allowances are needed, and the number of people who are unemployed, give silent testimony to the fact that the challenge is not being met by this government. This measure is only a stop gap. At best, FISP will not even restore the buying power of the family allowance of 1945. It is not a new advance. It has not even broken new ground. It is only restoring part, not all, of what has been lost because of the selectivity factor which cuts off families in the higher income brackets. Not only does this bill fail to close the gap between the buying power of the family allowance cheque in 1945 and the buying power of FISP cheque today, it does not include an automatic escalator clause to keep pace with this inflationary government.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the minister is such a bad fellow, but you never know who might be in that portfolio next! It is true that at the whim of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, benefit levels may be raised but that is not automatic. As a matter of fact, the principle of FISP is at odds with other social security schemes. We have universality in medicare and unemployment insurance, but we have selectivity in FISP. Why? Working wives, for example, will be compensated for day-care costs up to a certain sum, and maternity benefits are paid by unemployment insurance, but FISP penalizes the working wife by cut-off levels being based on gross family income. In other words, she is penalized for working.

Actually, this aspect hits poorer people harder than anyone else because the wife goes out to work and her added income results in getting less money for the children through family allowance. This seems to me to be grossly unfair, and the cut-off level should be based on net income after deductions rather than gross income. In