

Member has indicated that it is not a direct quote. I have the point the Hon. Member is making and I will give it consideration.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### ANIMAL PEDIGREE ACT

#### MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-67, an Act respecting animal pedigree associations, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There is presently on the Order Paper one motion to amend Bill C-67, an Act respecting animal pedigree associations, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster).

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the Parties and there is general agreement that consent be given with respect to the following. The Hon. Member for Algoma in whose name the motion stands has been detained in his riding, unfortunately, because of weather. He has asked me if the House would give its consent to have the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) move the motion in his stead. I understand that the Government is favourable to this idea, as are members of the New Democratic Party.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it so agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Don Boudria (for Mr. Foster) moved:**

That Bill C-67, be amended in Clause 59 by deleting lines 42 to 44 at page 28 and lines 1 to 13 at page 29 and substituting the following therefor:

“59.(1) The registration or identification of animals of a distinct breed or evolving breed in respect of which an association is incorporated may be performed only by the association, or by the Corporation on behalf of the association, and may not be performed by any other association notwithstanding any contract or arrangement to the contrary.

(2) Nothing in subsection (1) shall preclude any association from entering into any contract or arrangement for the normal conduct of its business and affairs.”

He said: Mr. Speaker, I stand on behalf of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) who was the representative of our Party on the legislative committee dealing with Bill C-67. When one is asked to substitute for a person who was on a committee and who is detained one has to pinch-hit, as we sometimes say. Notwithstanding that fact, as the deputy agriculture critic for our Party I am pleased to act on behalf of my colleague in proposing this amendment to the House.

The amendment which I am proposing is a brief one. I wish to refresh the memory of the House as to the contents of the

### *Animal Pedigree Act*

amendment in question. Basically what we want to do is to amend Clause 59 of the Bill. In the first draft of the Bill Clause 59 was known as Clause 54. The current Clause 59—the one amended at committee—was amended by a member of the Conservative Party. I have the Hon. Member's name here but I know that we are to recognize a Member by his constituency. I believe it is the Hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Brigh-twell), if my memory serves me well in terms of the appropriate name of the constituency of the Hon. Member in question.

The Hon. Member for Perth introduced an amendment to the Bill thereby deleting Clause 59 and replacing it with something entirely different. That clause, removed by the amendment of the Hon. Member for Perth, states:

54.(1) The registration or identification of animals of a distinct breed or evolving breed in respect of which an association is incorporated may be performed only by the association, or by the Corporation on behalf of the association, and may not be performed by any other association notwithstanding any contract or arrangement to the contrary.

(2) Nothing in subsection (1) shall preclude any association from entering into any contract or arrangement for the normal conduct of its business and affairs.

That is also the amendment I propose on behalf of the Hon. Member for Algoma. Everything that is in the amendment was in the government Bill before it was changed as a result of an amendment moved by the Hon. Member for Perth.

There are a number of things that disturb me about the way in which this whole matter was dealt with by members of the Conservative caucus. Principally, I am worried about the fact that the Canadian Livestock Records Corporation, or the corporation, according to this Bill, is mainly federally funded. Because of the fact that this funding goes to this organization the absence of the clause, its removal, means that the Government now wants to privatize that particular function. I am echoing here the sentiments of the Hon. Member for Algoma which he stated at committee.

I see that the Parliamentary Secretary is with us today. I hope that in the unlikely event that he is willing to consider our amendment, he is at least willing to place on record in the House that there is no attempt in any way, shape or form by the Government to privatize the function that I previously described.

The other concern that we have is the following. It is that if the Canadian Livestock Record Corporation loses its authority it will eventually lose the registration business of the larger associations, hence making it more costly to maintain the records of the small associations. It is somewhat like the argument that Canada Post brings to our attention at times. In other words, if someone else is allowed to do part of the more lucrative business the corporation will be left with the more difficult or less lucrative business. This means that it will be more costly to operate that part of the business because of the fact that the good business will be gone. This is a concern that was raised at committee by some groups.