

*Adjournment Debate*

ly speaking, provincial medical care insurance plans provide for some measure of consultation and in some cases formal negotiation at periodic intervals between the medical profession and the responsible authority before payment from the plan will be revised.

The federal legislation permits the medical care insurance plans of participating provinces to remunerate doctors by other methods, such as by full-time or part-time salaries, sessional fees or various combinations of contractual arrangements, but the prevailing method of payment to date has been on a fee for service basis.

With respect to the matter of establishing a relationship between time and particular medical services, this is certainly not a new phenomenon. For many years various provincial medical associations have elected to base professional remuneration on the time required to perform a particular kind or amount of service. Although the time factor is often recognized in these areas of care, generally speaking existing fee schedules are marked by a lack of differentiation according to the time taken by a doctor to render services especially in the case of office visit services.

In the case of Quebec I am informed that the question of inserting in a contract the amount of time the doctor is required to spend with his patient refers to the minimum of time, not the maximum. As the minister pointed out in the House on April 17, "There does not appear to be any intention of restricting the time spent with patients". I trust this adequately outlines to the hon. member the federal government's responsibility in this area.

LABOUR CONDITIONS—POSSIBILITY OF MEETING MR.  
FITZSIMMONS, PRESIDENT OF TEAMSTERS' UNION—  
GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta):** Madam Speaker, I want to use my time tonight talking about a great boycott, about which a lot of Canadians have heard, but about which very few Canadians know very much.

I was shocked last week when I read a letter the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) sent the labour critic of our party inviting him to join the minister in a handshaking ceremony with Mr. Cesar Chavez at the front doors of parliament. I have not been here very long but I do not think this type of thing has happened very often, that is, ministers of the Crown meeting people, especially foreign dignitaries, at the front door of this House in a public ceremony, especially the leader of a union which does not have any representatives in Canada.

My question to the minister last week was whether he would accord the president of the Teamsters' Union, the competing union in this great boycott in the United States, the same treatment. I have seen Mr. Fitzsimmons up in our parliamentary restaurant on different occasions when he was with the president of the Teamsters' Union in Canada, who happens to be one of the hon. members of that place next door. Yet I do not believe there has been any move to have the Minister of Labour meet Mr. Fitzsimmons at the front door.

I was also surprised to learn that the Minister of Labour was hosting a luncheon for Mr. Chavez and some of his

people. I will admit that the minister, when he recognized my interest, was kind enough to invite me to the luncheon, which I did attend and at which I listened to Mr. Chavez. I also believe it is very important that this House makes sure that Canadians know exactly what is going on in respect of the grape boycott by having Mr. Fitzsimmons up here to explain the teamsters' side on the subject of this boycott in the United States.

Because I had an interest in this subject I made a trip down to California over a year and half ago, on which occasion I spoke to many of the farmers in the area who were very concerned. To my amazement I found out that at one time Mr. Chavez's union controlled a large number of the farm workers. As of this time the teamsters have about 400 contracts in California and Mr. Chavez has only about 14. The teamsters represent between 25,000 and 30,000 workers, while Mr. Chavez represents around 5,000.

A few weeks ago I took a trip down to this area in order to check into some of the things I had discovered a year previously. I called on a man by the name of K. K. Larsen, who own a large grape farm near the area of Indio, California. I went to see him because he has a unique farm. It is one that was under the control of Mr. Chavez's union, the United Farm Workers. He had a free vote of the workers that was conducted by a Father Humphreys. Mr. Chavez goes around the country saying that he has a lot of support from the Catholic Church and other churches, but Father Humphreys happens to be a Catholic priest in the area and he volunteered to hold a free vote of the workers on that farm. The workers on that farm voted 66 to 22 to have the Teamsters' Union come back in.

I visited that farm for the prime purpose of speaking to the farm workers there, because I wanted to determine why they preferred the teamsters over Mr. Chavez. I heard many stories of the same kind I heard from Mr. Chavez about people being beaten up. There was even some talk about murder and the burning down of some buildings. I heard the same thing about Mr. Chavez from people who do not like him. I would admit that some of these stories are possibly true and that there have been some rough-housing tactics, but they have been done by both sides. They have been done under provocation, and I believe they would have happened no matter what anyone did in an attempt to stop them.

In talking to these workers I discovered that they were very happy to be under the Teamsters' Union. They had medical care benefits much better than those under Mr. Chavez. They were quite pleased, as are most farm workers in California, that Governor Brown brought in a bill in the legislature of the State of California which would call for elections in the State of California for all farm workers. Mr. Chavez has been going around the country saying that the Teamsters did not want a vote and that they preferred the situation the way it was. In any contact I have had with members of the Teamsters Union I was told they would agree to a vote, that they wanted a vote. They wanted their conditions, as did Mr. Chavez. Now they have finally got most of their points together and the bill is passing through the California legislature. We will see free votes.

Part of what really disturbs me about seeing Mr. Chavez coming here and receiving support from the Canadian