

Farm Credit Act

definitions in the regulations which will distinguish between a family farm and a corporate farm. However, there is no provision in the act that the regulations will be changed. The act provides that the corporation may make definitions in regard to an economic farm unit, a single farming enterprise, a co-operative farm association and a farming corporation, but it does not say that there shall be a definition which will specifically spell out what is a family farm.

The minister says that certainly there will be a distinction made in the regulations. If he were to include in this clause, in addition to "farming corporation", the expression "a family farm", then a definition would have to be made in the regulations of both types of operations or both types of corporation, if I may put it in that way. Why does the minister not make this definition statutory and insert it in the act? I cannot understand his reluctance on this point. All he has to do is insert three words in the bill.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would help the hon. gentleman to understand the position if I were to tell him that we see no purpose in inserting redundant words in an act. I would also draw to his attention that clause 1, which has already been passed by the committee, provides very clearly that a farming corporation will be defined by regulation. What the committee accepted when it passed that clause was the amendment of the former clause which provided:

"farmer" means a person whose principal occupation is farming, and, for the purposes of Part II, includes a co-operative farm association and a family farming corporation as defined by regulation;

So the act originally provided that a family farm corporation would be defined by regulation. We are now deleting the word "family" for reasons that I have explained a number of times, and all of which I find valid.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Chairman, I find it hard to understand the minister's reluctance to make this simple adjustment that would please everyone in the house and would be a very good thing for the minister to do.

I remember that last year in the house reference was made to a famous occasion in the fall of 1950. I remember that occasion very well because I had been elected to the house a few months before. Parliament had been called to deal with a railway strike. Mr. St. Laurent, the prime minister of the day, presented a bill which needed a simple adjustment but one which the opposition asked the prime minister to make so that

there would be no misunderstanding. The prime minister agreed to this and promised that it would be done when the regulations were promulgated. Later it turned out that the prime minister's promise was not carried out, that it had no bearing whatever on the legislation, and the regulation was never passed.

Therefore, because of the importance of family farms to those who rely on them for their livelihood, and in view of the reasonableness of the request that has been made by the hon. member for Crowfoot, I would urge the minister to be reasonable. If he intends to make this change by regulation, then I would ask him to have the bigness and the generosity to make a slight change in the bill now so that there can be no doubt about it in the future.

Mr. Olson: The only reason for not doing so, as I hope hon. gentlemen opposite can understand, is that we would have to go through the entire bill and include those words because they appear nowhere else. Clause 8 relates to other clauses and to phrases that are used throughout the bill. Therefore there will be definitions of these words in the bill and in the regulations.

Clause 1, which the committee has already passed, provides that the government has the right to define a farming corporation. I have already given an undertaking that the distinction between shareholders of such a corporation who are related and those who are not will be made in the regulations. It is not a question of resisting something here; it is just that we want all of the words in the bill to make sense.

I do not want to repeat the reasons for changing the wording so that corporations that are composed not necessarily of blood relatives can be recognized by the F.C.C. This is why we have used the term "farming corporation" rather than excluding all but a family corporation. I think all of the reasons I have given are valid. Putting in one or two words does not worry me that much, but surely they should be useful words. Everything for which hon. gentlemen opposite have asked is already provided for in the bill and will be provided for by regulation. I have already given an undertaking to that effect.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Chairman, without arguing further on the subject, because I do want to get the bill through today, I move:

That on page 6, line 28, after the word "corporation" the following be added:
"and family farm".