

systems and staff. It will also allow a choice of record keeping and registration services other than that provided by the new Canadian Livestock Records Corporation. This proposed amendment to the Bill as reported to the House in no way reflects upon the ability of the new Canadian Livestock Records Corporation to provide a service.

For some associations, it will mean a cost saving which will allow them to concentrate their efforts and finances on such other important activities as promoting, improving, testing, and showing breeds. The amendment of the Hon. Member for Algoma, as presented by the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, could result in a reduction of the resources needed to support those positive activities.

I appreciate that the Members who supported this proposed amendment want assurances that the new legislation is in the best interests of Canadian industry. I am pleased to assure all Members that Clause 59 of the new Animal Pedigree Act, as it now stands, will ensure the continuing credibility and integrity of the Canadian livestock pedigree record system.

I remind all Members of the House that, under the current Clause 59, arrangements between associations for the registration of animals will have to be approved by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise). This will ensure that quality and integrity of record keeping services are demonstrated.

If the Minister of Agriculture is not fully satisfied that a breed association can fulfil the requirements for registering and keeping records of animals on behalf of another association, the Minister will not approve the arrangement. It is as simple as that.

As a further guarantee of the integrity of the new system, the Minister of Agriculture can terminate any previously approved arrangements between breed associations, if there is evidence that an association is not living up to its responsibilities regarding the record keeping and registration of animals.

Throughout its long history, the Canadian National Livestock Records Corporation has maintained a high standard and a record of service to breed associations and thereby to Canadian agriculture. Under Clause 59, the Government is convinced that the new Canadian National Livestock Records Corporation can continue to provide the services of its predecessor while also standing up to the challenge of competition from other breed associations.

In conclusion, Clause 59, as amended in the legislative committee, should stand. It is a good amendment. It provides for competition where there might otherwise be an unjustified monopoly. The majority of breed associations do not oppose Clause 59 because it offers the industry both flexibility and the protection of built-in safeguards. Most important, it also offers them a choice in record keeping and registration services.

I would ask that the Hon. Member who has moved the amendment, having considered the arguments presented on this side, might consider whether he wishes to withdraw it and allow the legislation to proceed without any further delay.

Animal Pedigree Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion, the nays have it. I declare the amendment lost.

Amendment (Mr. Foster) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will entertain the amendment of the Hon. Member for Brandon—Souris.

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That Bill C-67, an Act respecting animal pedigree associations, be amended in Clause 21 by striking out line 44 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"Members have responded in writing to the consulta-".

● (1530)

He said: Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the record I should like to indicate that we have consulted and indeed we recognize that this was simply a technical omission.

I very much appreciate the co-operation of the two opposition Parties in agreeing to the amendment at this time.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I just want to confirm for my part that indeed consultation took place. The amendment in question is purely technical in nature. Therefore, the Official Opposition is always glad to co-operate, as usual, with the Government in further improving legislation for the benefit of Canadian agriculture.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I concur with the proposed change. It simply clarifies the meaning of the Bill. I do not think it changes the meaning in any way and leaves no doubt as to what the meaning was intended to be.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the debate, but I should like to take this opportunity to thank members of the committee. As chairman of the committee it was a real pleasure to work with the two members of the Opposition and Members on this side of the House. They were clearly objective. There were representations from a great number of organizations, and I think that