

Madam Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 4,942 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

FM BROADCASTING IN CANADA

Question No. 4,942—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. How many different programming formats for FM radio does the CRTC license and what are those formats?
2. For what reason does the CRTC require strict adherence to particular formats?
3. What studies, if any, have been done for the government or for the CRTC to determine whether there is greater variety in programming in comparable United States or Canadian markets?
4. How many persons are employed by the CRTC to monitor (a) all broadcasters' (b) FM broadcasters' compliance with all federal programming requirements for broadcasters?
5. How often are individual FM stations monitored to ensure their compliance with CRTC programming requirements?
6. How many FM stations are there in Canada?
7. How many FM stations are monitored each year for their compliance with federal programming requirements?
8. What records must be kept by FM stations in order to permit the CRTC to ensure compliance with the federal requirements?
9. What is the direct cost to FM broadcasters of compliance with CRTC requirements?
10. Was an estimate made of the loss to FM broadcasters from foregone revenue as a result of compliance with CRTC regulations and (a) if so, on what date and how was such an estimate made (b) if not, for what reason was it not made?
11. If an FM broadcaster wishes to adjust his format as a result of market requirements, how does he go about receiving the CRTC's approval?
12. On average, how long does it take to achieve a decision from the CRTC on a proposed format change?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Evans: I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as

Western Grain Transportation Act

reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motions Nos. 24, 25, 26 and 29 (Mr. Benjamin) and Motion No. 27 (Mr. Gustafson).

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to stand and participate in the debate on Motion No. 27 which deals with representation on the Senior Grain Transportation Committee. I am somewhat surprised that the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) had so little to say on the matter of the statutory Crow rate. I believe his speech consisted of less than a couple of lines.

I was also surprised that Government Members were not here for two hours and delayed debate on this Bill this morning.

Since this is a historical piece of legislation with which we are dealing and because representation on the Transportation Committee is so important, I believe it is fair to say that the farmers in western Canada are very concerned about who is represented. I believe if one studied the action and direction which the Progressive Conservative Party has taken with this Bill, one will find that we have constantly recommended producer representation on the Transportation Committee. While certain Members have said that the Conservatives had taken one position then and another position now, I suggest that nothing is further from the truth. I have reread some of the speeches made by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) and also went as far as to read some of mine. I want to suggest that since the outset of debate on Bill C-155 this spring, which has gone on for some time, we have constantly defended the position of the primary producer and the farmer.

The statutory Crow rate was originally established so that produce could be delivered to the open water ports of this country which, in most cases, are more than 1,000 miles away. It was most important that the agreements which were reached at that time would allow the producers the right to believe that their products would get to the markets of the world, and it is our position that this Bill in no way would obstruct the rights and the privileges of the producer to produce his grain and realize a fair return for his production.

In dealing with Motion No. 27 in particular, I want to go back to the original proposal that was put forward and amended by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight). In keeping with the direction that our Party has taken, it was suggested that there should first be a producer representation of one from the Province of Alberta, two from the Province of Saskatchewan due to its high production of grain as compared to Alberta and Manitoba, and one producer from the Province of Manitoba. It was the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster, on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party, who implemented this on behalf of the producers.

Our reason for moving Motion No. 27 is that we believe it is important that there be equal representation from producer elevators and grain line companies. Basically, this motion states that there will be three members from the grain line