

those who are told they must choose a lawyer on such lists. But when a person is so told to choose, it derogates from his or her right of free choice and in that sense is wrong. Further, I would think such practice offends the basic principles of liberalism or free choice, if such principles are still practised by hon. members opposite.

Finally, in presenting my mildly worded case, may I say this: When I raised the question initially in the present session of parliament a lady called me up and said, "Mr. McCleave, you are on the right track absolutely; they showed me a list"—this lady was from Dartmouth—"I had to choose a lawyer from the list and he charged me \$200 more than my neighbour in the same subdivision was charged, who also took out a CMHC mortgage." She said, "I just guessed wrong, Mr. McCleave; I hope you win this war." So do I, Mr. Speaker. We will find out from the parliamentary secretary if I have won.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier\* (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, contrary to the allegation made by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) on November 1, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation follows the normal practice of mortgage lenders in selecting the legal agent to process mortgage documents. He is employed to search and report on title, to register the mortgage and advance the mortgage funds, and to certify to CMHC that its mortgage constitutes a first charge on the property. In the case of loans for the provision of housing to persons of low income, requests for the employment of the borrower's solicitor or notary are in many cases granted where the employment will produce a financial advantage to the borrower. In addition, in the case of loans on existing housing, where the borrower has employed a solicitor or notary to carry out the work of acquiring the title to the property, CMHC may employ the borrower's solicitor or notary to act on behalf of CMHC.

CMHC has, as a general rule, followed the practice of all government departments and agencies and employed agents approved by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). The present practice with respect to CMHC is that, with the approval of the Minister of Justice, as the hon. member so generously stated, the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) from time to time provides the corporation with the names of legal agents who may be employed for these purposes in various municipalities throughout the country.

In summary, of the 231,000 new housing units started in Canada in 1975, less than 6 per cent would require the services of legal agents selected by CMHC.

AGRICULTURE—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE BEEF QUOTAS  
APPLICABLE ONLY TO MEAT IN TRANSIT TO CANADA ON  
OCTOBER 17

**Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat):** Mr. Speaker, my remarks tonight relate to some further comments on the subject of offshore beef imports from Australia and New

### *Adjournment Debate*

Zealand. In particular they will deal with my question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) on October 27.

I commend the minister most sincerely for three comments he made in his response to me on that occasion. First is his statement with respect to negotiations that are "still being discussed with both New Zealand and Australian officials." It is important that these discussions should continue with regard to offshore beef imports into Canada.

Second is the minister's admission, finally, that these imports had been entering Canada prior to the "six cent under" agreement "for as much as 31 cents per pound less than it was selling in the United States". That is a significant admission in that the minister and his senior staff people would never admit to any discount in price until after the agreement last June which introduced the "six cent under" rule.

Third is his firm statement, and I quote:

New negotiations will take place; I hope the result will be that meat shipped to Canada will be sold at a price no different from that of meat shipped to the United States under the quota system which has been imposed—

I hope the minister can convince his colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Chrétien), that this is the only way these offshore beef imports can be regulated as to price. After all why should a pound of offshore beef be worth any less in Canada than the same pound of beef in the United States?

That "six cent under" rule as it now operates on offshore beef imports represents a total loss already sustained by Canadian cattle producers of somewhere between \$30 million and \$40 million. This admission to me in that reply of October 27 is a clear indication that the minister was over-ruled in cabinet by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce or that he, the Minister of Agriculture has since changed his mind on the fairness of this "six cent under" rule.

While I agree with the three comments of the minister in his response to me in the House on October 27, I continue to disagree completely with his continued reference to the United States cattle and beef industry as a supply management system simply because that country has its own meat import law with power to impose quotas by presidential order. American cattle and beef producers continue to have complete freedom of choice as to how they wish to market their production and there is absolutely no supply management of their production.

It is very reassuring to note that in a recent speech to the Canadian Simmental Association on November 12 the minister finally admitted that these offshore beef imports do affect our prices. In that speech he made this statement:

Beef imports into Canada, particularly from Oceanic countries, have been large this year. They affected our prices somewhat.

He could have been just a little more specific by saying the effect was to depress our prices somewhat. That would have been the understatement of the year. After all, why was this new import quota imposed last month if it was not because of depressed cattle prices in Canada?