

Farm Credit Act

minister to consider the recommendation I am making. As I have said, I am not eager to move another amendment. I cannot see why the minister would not leave "family farm corporation" in the clause and include "farm corporation" if he desires. I do not want to move an amendment but somebody on the government side could. It bothers me a little to have the family farm stricken from the clause. The minister believes in the farm corporation.

Mr. Olson: The answer is so simple I am sure it is obvious to the hon. member. Family farm corporations are included in farm corporations. It would be redundant to add those words. If it is a farm corporation or a family farm corporation, it is right in there.

Mr. Horner: It may well be in there and it may not. There may be a difference in the total number of shareholders permissible for a family farm corporation. Far be it for me to say that the bill is so well or carefully drafted that it can do without two extra words in it. It cannot be said that these two words are not absolutely needed. We may have to have three extra words so that the provision would read, and/or a family farm. I am sure the minister would find there was a difference in the regulations between the number of shares that would have to be held by blood relations for a family farm corporation and the shareholders of a corporate farm. I say to the minister that while they may be the same they are not necessarily the same. In order to encourage the continued existence of the family farm, I sincerely urge the minister and his associates to include those words—and a family farm.

I cannot emphasize this point too much. If the minister believes that the family farm has been the mainstay of the agricultural industry in the past and will continue to be in the future, I am sure he will accede to my request. If he does not believe in the family farm, if he wants to treat the family farm the same as the corporate farm, then let him strike out those words. I really do not believe he wants to do that. I really do not believe the members of this committee want to do that.

I am not moving an amendment at this time but I am pleading with him to add these words to cover the family farm. The amendment would be simple and could go through within three minutes. This is a very important point. No politician who has ever campaigned in the rural parts of Canada from

[Mr. Horner.]

one end of the country to the other was ever elected by disregarding the family farm. The minister knows it. He can say that these words would be redundant, that "farming corporation" includes a family farm. It may, but not necessarily. I urge the minister, therefore, to quickly draft an amendment to include these words. I do not want to move an amendment because when an amendment comes from this side of the house all the backbenchers on the other side seem to think they have to vote against it. All the members on that side of the house seem to believe that all the brains are on that side. I do not want to place the family farm in jeopardy. I do not want the credit for moving the amendment, I want the family farm to be covered by this bill. This is all I want. I urge the minister to have one of his boys quickly prepare an amendment so that the family farm will be preserved.

Mr. Olson: The position the hon. member for Crowfoot is taking now, Mr. Chairman, I think was well expressed by the minister when we were dealing with clause 1. Clause 1 asserts that a farm corporation will be defined by regulation. We intend to put in the regulation a definition of the various kinds of corporations. I thought that was already clear to the hon. member.

Mr. Horner: Just on that point—

Mr. Olson: Wait until I make this explanation which apparently the hon. gentleman missed. The definition will make a distinction between shareholders who are related and those who are not in so far as share distribution is concerned. Indeed, the definition of the family farm corporation that is in the regulations now very likely will be carried into the new regulations.

● (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Horner: I do not want to belabour this point, Mr. Chairman. I remember debating this question earlier, and since I realized that was not the time to move an amendment to this clause I waited, as the rules provide I should, until clause 8 came under discussion. I then broached the subject. The minister may scold me, if he pleases, for not remembering what took place before, but I do remember the debate and the explanation given by the minister at the time.

We are now on clause 8 and I am making a final plea. The minister has said there will be